



SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE 127th IPU ASSEMBLY

Québec City (Canada)

21-26 October 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	3
Inaugural ceremony	
· Speech by Mr. Noël A. Kinsella, Speaker of the Senate of Canada	4
· Speech by Ms. Chris Charlton, Member of the Parliament of Canada	4
· Message of the United Nations Secretary-General, delivered by Mr. Peter Launskey-Tieffenthal, United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Public Information	4
· Speech by Mr. Abdelwahad Radi, President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union	5
· Speech by Mr. David Lloyd Johnston, Governor General of Canada	6
Special address	
· Mr. John Baird, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada	7
Organization of the work of the Assembly	
· Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the 127 th Assembly	7
· Consideration of requests for the inclusion of an emergency item in the Assembly agenda	11
· Final Assembly Agenda	12
Plenary debate on the emergency item: The institutional and security situation in Mali	13
Special debate on Citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world	15
IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs	
· Adoption of the Agenda	44
· Session I: Roundtable discussion: Multilateralism and the role of parliamentary diplomacy .	44
· Session II: Special Session on Observing United Nations Day (24 October)	53
· Session III: Panel discussion on Rio+ 20 in perspective: What hope for sustainable development?.....	63
· Session IV: UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Five Years On	66

	<u>Page</u>
· Special Gender Partnership Session on Gender-sensitive Parliaments	69
Consideration of reports from the break-out groups and presentation of the Plan of Action for Gender-sensitive Parliaments	81
Panel discussions on the subject items chosen for debate during the 128th Assembly (Quito, 22-27 March 2013)	
· Enforcing the responsibility to protect: The role of parliament in safeguarding civilians' lives	
First Standing Committee on Peace and International Security	84
· Fair trade and innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable development	
Second Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade	95
· The use of media, including social media, to enhance citizen engagement and democracy	
Third Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights	105
Other Panel sessions	
· Panel session: Creating opportunities for youth in today's global economy	116
· Panel session: Building peace after conflict	123
· Panel session: Parliamentary immunity: Benefit or burden?	130
· Panel session: Peak Oil: What prospects for energy security?	141
Adoption of resolutions, outcome documents and reports	
· Emergency item : The institutional and security situation in Mali	147
· The Québec City Declaration	147
· Plan of Action for Gender-sensitive Parliaments	148
· Report of the IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs.....	148
Closure of the Assembly	148
Annexes	
Annex I The institutional and security situation in Mali	
Text of the resolution	150
Annex II Québec City Declaration on Citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world	
Text of the Declaration	152
Annex III Plan of Action for Gender-sensitive Parliaments	157
Annex IV Report of the IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs	166
Annex V List of participants	170

INTRODUCTION

The 127th IPU Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union took place at the Québec City Convention Centre, Québec City, Canada, from 21 to 26 October 2012.

Attendance at the Assembly was as follows:

Members: Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palestine, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Seychelles, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Associate Members: Parliament of the Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa (CEMAC), East African Legislative Assembly (EALA), Parliament of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Inter-Parliamentary Committee of the West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU), Latin American Parliament and the Transitional Arab Parliament.

Observers: (i) United Nations system: United Nations (UN), International Labour Organization (ILO), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), World Bank, Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO); (ii) League of Arab States; (iii) African Parliamentary Union (APU), Arab Inter-Parliamentary Union (AIPU), Association of Senates, Shooras and Equivalent Councils in Africa and the Arab World (ASSECAA), Confederation of Parliaments of the Americas (COPA), Interparliamentary Assembly of Member Nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (IPA CIS), Interparliamentary Assembly on Orthodoxy (IAO), Inter-Parliamentary Union of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IPU-IGAD), Maghreb Consultative Council, Parliamentary Assembly of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (PABSEC), Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe Parliamentary Assembly (OSCE PA), Parliamentary Assembly of Turkic-speaking Countries (TURKPA), Parliamentary Assembly of the Union of Belarus and the Russian Federation, Parliamentary Union of the Organization of the Islamic Conference Member States (PUOICM), Southern African Development Community Parliamentary Forum (SADC PF); (iv) Socialist International; (v) The Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria, Human Rights Watch, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child health (PMNCH), Penal Reform International and World Scout Parliamentary Union (WSPU).

Of the 1,256 participants who attended the Assembly, 624 were members of parliament. The parliamentarians included 42 Speakers, 35 Deputy Speakers and 175 women parliamentarians (28 per cent).

INAUGURAL CEREMONY

Sunday, 21 October 2012

The inaugural ceremony of the 127th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union was opened at 6.30 p.m., with an aboriginal blessing by Grand Chief Konrad Sioui, Huron-Wendat Nation Council Grand Chief.

Mr. NOEL A. KINSELLA, Speaker of the Senate of Canada, said that that was the fourth time the Parliament of Canada was hosting an IPU Assembly, with 2012 also marking the 100th anniversary of Canada's formal affiliation to the Organization. The IPU stood out as a key organization in assisting parliaments and parliamentarians in responding effectively to the needs of people and their aspirations for peace, human rights, gender equality and development. Those were matters of great importance to Canadian citizens and parliamentarians.

The Parliament of Canada championed the overall theme of the 127th Assembly, namely, Citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world, in view of its congruency with IPU values. Those issues presupposed respect for human rights. In today's environment of interdependence, democratization, global challenges and multiplication of communications, inter-parliamentary relations had taken on a new dimension.

By offering additional channels of communication, parliamentary diplomacy served as a complementary tool to traditional diplomacy on sensitive issues. The interpersonal connections created through those interactions contributed to easing inter-State tensions. He concluded by expressing his confidence that the 127th IPU Assembly would reinforce the value of parliamentary diplomacy and would continue to build the common knowledge and mutual understanding for the benefit of all countries and their people.

Ms. CHRIS CHARLTON, Member of the Parliament of Canada, speaking on behalf of Mr. Andrew Scheer, Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada, welcomed all delegates to the 127th Assembly of the IPU in Québec City. She noted that the Assembly was particularly special for the Parliament of Canada. While it marked the fourth time since 1925 that Canada had hosted the IPU, it was the first time an Assembly would be held outside the capital. Just four years previously, Canada had celebrated the 400th anniversary of Samuel de Champlain's founding of Québec City. Through his pioneering spirit, Champlain had been able to establish the first permanent French settlement in North America.

She said that Québec was an exceptional city, imbued with a francophone character, a rich culture, outstanding architecture and exceptional cuisine. It was the cradle of French-speaking North America. All of those features made Québec City a fitting choice for the 127th Assembly, during which a Special Debate would address citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world.

The sessions, she elaborated, would cover issues of direct relevance to the ideals of the IPU, which Canada strongly shared: the promotion and advancement of the core values of parliamentary democracy, human rights and gender equality. As evidenced in the agenda, delegates would not only be exploring those core tenets of parliamentary work, but would also be tackling directly some of the most challenging and pressing issues facing policymakers and citizens today.

Twice a year, parliamentarians from countries spanning the globe came together for IPU assemblies. It was a forum that allowed parliamentarians to address complex global problems, as well as sensitive societal issues such as reconciliation and inclusion. She concluded by encouraging all delegates to take full advantage of the occasion to reinforce the ideals of representative democracy and the merits of the parliamentary perspective as they debated those pressing issues currently facing the global community. The Parliament of Canada was honoured to host the 127th IPU Assembly.

Mr. PETER LAUNSKY-TIEFFENTHAL, United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Public Information, said that at a time of rising insecurity, injustice, inequality and intolerance, robust parliamentary engagement could make a significant difference in promoting common progress and shared values. Parliamentarians played a key role in ratifying global treaties and agreements. Legislative

action translated international standards into local laws. Budgetary authority invested parliamentarians with the power to put people first. The commitment to democratic governance advanced the rule of law at the national and international levels.

Sustainable development was one of the top priorities of the UN Secretary-General. The 2015 deadline for achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) was approaching fast. He called for the support of delegates to accelerate progress towards meeting the MDGs in all regions. He also appealed for the engagement of parliamentarians in the Education First, Sustainable Energy for All and Every Woman Every Child initiatives and in meeting the Zero Hunger Challenge, launched earlier in the year at the Rio+ 20 Conference. He said that the participation of parliamentarians was needed in the important effort to articulate a post-2015 development agenda. They had a clear role to play in promoting gender equality, in particular greater participation of women in parliament, especially in the many countries where the percentages were woefully low and women's voices were not being heard.

He welcomed the decision to have a Special debate on Citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world. The exclusion of marginalized groups was often at the heart of violent conflict and social unrest. The imperative of inclusiveness, pluralism and human rights permeated UN engagements, from prevention to peacebuilding and electoral assistance. Ensuring the full and equal participation of women was essential for peace and stability to take root.

He concluded by saying that, in a time of turmoil and global transition, they must deepen their strategic partnership and raise levels of ambition. As partners, they could meet today's tests and seize the opportunities of an era of dramatic change.

Mr. ABDELWAHAD RADI, President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, said that Canada was known for the vast diversity of its territory and, above all, for the vast diversity of Canadian society and for its ability to allow all ethnic, religious, cultural, linguistic and political components of society live in harmony. He noted that 2012 marked the 100th anniversary of the Canadian Parliament's affiliation to the IPU. What better way could there be to celebrate that centenary than by holding the 127th IPU Assembly in Canada?

The Québec Assembly promised to be special in every way, with a rich format and agenda. During the Assembly a special debate on the theme of citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world would be held. The conclusion of the debate would see an outcome document that should offer many clues as to how to better deal with ever increasing diversity, turn it to their advantage and, in the process, build more inclusive and tolerant societies.

That value should apply not just to societies as a whole but also to the IPU, which strove to be universal but could not achieve universality without espousing participation, integration and inclusiveness. He very much regretted that not all parliamentarians who had registered to attend the Assembly had been successful in obtaining entry visas to Canada. He considered that an unfortunate and regrettable turn of events that was not only serious but unprecedented in the history of the IPU.

The 127th Assembly was also special in that it would have an extensive programme of events with panel sessions covering a wide cross-section of themes ranging from creating opportunities for youth, building peace after conflict and parliamentary immunity to peak oil and prospects for energy security.

Since the end of the Cold War, country after country had been instituting democratic reforms. Enormous efforts had been made to lift millions of people out of poverty and the MDGs had helped the international community focus on bringing essential services to the poorest and most vulnerable. Partial success had been achieved.

He noted the new fault lines developing along religious, racial, cultural and political divides, the development of international criminal syndicates and lawlessness and terrorist groups destabilizing and inflicting untold suffering on many countries. The conflict in Syria was threatening to engulf the region in a conflict and might well end up igniting sectarian violence throughout the Middle East and beyond.

Still, he was convinced that if they could ask every man, woman and child in the world for their opinion, they would respond that the will of people must be the basis of the authority of government. Peace and prosperity would never have a chance if there was no respect for differences in political views or a genuine commitment to using dialogue to end disputes. He concluded by saying that if there was one lesson to be drawn from the Arab Spring, it was the critical importance of political diversity on the one hand and dialogue to achieve peace and democracy on the other.

Mr. DAVID LLOYD JOHNSTON, Governor General of Canada, said that he had the honour of representing Her Majesty the Queen in Canada. One of his most important responsibilities was to ensure that parliament functioned effectively and democratically, and that the country always had a prime minister and a government in place that enjoyed the confidence of parliament.

In Canada, as elsewhere, parliament was the highest expression of the country's democratic ideals. Parliament was the place where democracy was enacted in the hard work of the governing party and the loyal opposition, and it served as the ultimate symbol of their values of equality, fairness and justice. Consequently, the IPU could be viewed as the parliament of parliaments and a forum for dialogue and cooperation which continued to instruct and inspire.

Just as the IPU had been born after a meeting between French and English parliamentarians in 1888, parliamentary democracy in Canada could be said to have been born of a partnership between a French and an English Canadian in the 1840s. As the Assembly agenda indicated, those were exciting and challenging times for parliamentarians. But despite the rapid and profound changes they faced, the fundamental principle of parliamentary democracy remained as fresh and as vital as ever.

Parliament was where issues were resolved through words rather than force and that was why the success of the Assembly was so critical to the smarter, more caring world that was dreamt of. As parliamentarians worked to strengthen democratic institutions, they must ask themselves the same questions posed by Joseph Howe, another central figure in the development of Canadian democracy: "What is right? What is just? What is for the public good?" With that in mind, he declared the 127th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and Related Meetings open.

The inaugural ceremony of the Inter-Parliamentary Union closed at 7.10 p.m.

SITTING
OF MONDAY 22 OCTOBER
(Morning)

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m. with the President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, Mr. A. Radi (Morocco) in the Chair.

Item 1 of the agenda

Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the 127th Assembly

The PRESIDENT said that the Governing Council had proposed that Mr. D.H. Oliver (Canada) should serve as the President of the 127th Assembly.

It was so decided

The President of the Assembly, Mr. D.H. Oliver (Canada) took the Chair.

The PRESIDENT invited the Speaker of the Senate of Canada, Mr. Noël A. Kinsella, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, Mr. John Baird, to the rostrum. He then invited the Minister to address the Assembly.

Mr. J. BAIRD, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, began by noting the importance of the special debate to be held on diversity. He stressed the timeliness of the debate given the turbulence and uncertainty in many parts of the world. Societies that were free, open and democratic stood as beacons of light. Those societies knew what it took to create the conditions for people to live with the dignity they craved. They knew that freedom, democracy and human rights were the values upon which pluralistic societies were built, but pluralism would not flourish unless diversity was embraced. Despite the many differences, there was one humanity shared by all. Sadly, there were forces of evil in the world that used those differences as weapons to marginalize minorities, often inciting violence against them. That was why free societies had a role to play.

The protection of human rights and dignity was an obligation that each State owed its citizens and a mutual obligation of all members of the international community. History had taught them that open, free, tolerant and pluralist societies were the best guarantee of respect for human rights and dignity. In many instances, those who threatened the security of humanity also showed no respect for human rights. Human rights abuses that did not threaten security were still a cause for concern. The enslavement of others was a vicious human rights abuse, and had taken many forms. Women were particularly vulnerable to the gravest abuses. For example, the early and forced marriage of young girls was a truly barbaric form of slavery. He gave the example of Habiba, a girl from Niger, who had been forced into marriage at age 14. At 15, she had become pregnant, having laboured for two days before being transferred to a regional hospital to have a caesarean. Sadly, she had lost her baby hours after he had been born, when a simple procedure could have saved his life. Her husband had left her and her village had rejected her. Today she lived with her mother, completely ostracized.

The Government of Canada was standing up for those girls even when it was not always expedient to do so. It did not shy away from such tough conversations. He had noted the shock of other countries, which had called him culturally insensitive for raising that issue. He would not stay quiet on an issue that was morally wrong and deserved to be condemned. How could anyone defend the practice of having a nine year-old girl forced into marriage? That was part of the important work Canada had been doing at the United Nations Human Rights Council and to spearhead the International Day of the Girl. It would intensify the country's diplomacy and development efforts to end early and forced marriage in every corner of the world. He called on all countries to follow suit. Sadly, too many world leaders had lost sight of the question of human rights. In his time as Foreign Minister, he had directly confronted some of them because there were times when diplomacy must be balanced with tough and direct talk. He stood firm on the principles that had made Canada economically prosperous and rich in terms of diversity.

Yet, too many countries had regressive and punitive laws that criminalized homosexuality. In some countries, those laws were unenforced hangovers from a bygone era. In others, they were actively and viciously implemented. Draconian punishment and unspeakable violence were inflicted on people simply because of whom they loved and who they were. Those people included David Kato, who had worked tirelessly as a defender of gay rights for Sexual Minorities Uganda, an organization that fought for social and legal equality for gays in Uganda. In 2010, a Ugandan tabloid newspaper had published the pictures and names of known homosexuals in that country with the headline "Hang them!" David was in one of those pictures. The following year, in his own home, David had been brutally bludgeoned to death with a hammer.

He noted that cases such as those drove him to raise delicate issues, often to the discomfort of the people sitting across the table, as he had at recent meetings in Australia and New York, where Canada had had the loudest voice. He had called on his colleagues to repeal regressive laws in their own countries because he firmly believed it was the role of the State to protect its people regardless of sex, sexuality or faith. The Government of Canada would speak out on the issues that mattered to Canadians – whether it was the role and treatment of women around the world, or the persecution of gays, or the cowardly and targeted attacks on those who prayed in the sanctity of churches, temples, mosques or synagogues.

Since the Government had promised to open an Office of Religious Freedoms, there had been considerable media interest. Critics claimed they were mixing politics and religion. They failed to see that it was all about defending fundamental human rights. The regime in the Islamic Republic of Iran was one poignant example of religious intolerance. Baha'is and Christians were consistently threatened with death and torture, simply for believing. Just two months previously, Iran had imposed a 20-year sentence on seven Baha'i leaders who had been in prison since 2008. In 2010, no evidence had been produced at the summary trials, and yet, they had been convicted for a series of national security crimes. A Jewish-Armenian couple had been secretly executed in Evin prison in March. Their only crime appeared to have been practising their faith. Canada would not stand still in the face of those egregious actions. That was why it had imposed some of the toughest sanctions against the regime and why it was committed to defending religious freedom in Iran and around the world. That was why Canada had led a human rights resolution on Iran at the United Nations for the past eight years.

Few people could change the course of history, but each individual, working towards furthering human dignity, respect and tolerance would be able to write the history of their generation and build a foundation for the world they would leave behind. It was that conviction that drove them to stand up for the rights of women, who in many countries were assaulted for wanting nothing more than to be treated equally. It was that conviction that drove them to stand up to those who sought to criminalize homosexuality. As parliamentarians, they must remember that those were not partisan issues; they transcended politics. He promoted Canada's principled foreign policy knowing there was broad support to give women a bigger role in societies where people were free to be and free to practise. As parliamentarians, they had a collective responsibility to act to make their dream, and the dream of the people they represented, real.

The PRESIDENT shared some personal reflections on the topic of the special debate. As co-Rapporteur of the Québec City Declaration, he recounted how he had been active in the Senate of Canada to promote equality, diversity and pluralism. As that Assembly was the crowning achievement of his parliamentary career, he noted that he would continue to fight for humanitarianism and to fight for the dignity of individuals, human rights and democratic freedom.

He stressed that, as parliamentarians, they could play a monitoring role and an information role in preparing, promoting and implementing international instruments. International inter-parliamentary organizations such as the IPU had the ability to remind Heads of State and Government that globalization must respect the needs and aspirations of the people.

With that in mind, it was therefore an honour to open the Special Debate on Citizenship, Identity and Linguistic and Cultural Diversity in a Globalized World.

Mr. N. NIGMATULIN (Kazakhstan) said that the Special Debate was as relevant as ever for the world. He noted that they were witnessing deep changes in the whole system of relations between countries and peoples. In the modern world, which was entrusted with strengthening tolerance and furthering the dialogue of civilizations, unfortunately, intercultural and interreligious contradictions had become visible and relations had deteriorated.

Kazakhstan's model of interethnic and inter-confessional dialogue and tolerance was based upon a number of principles. The first was the constitutional and legislative base. In Kazakhstan, there was a solid legislative basis that ensured the equality of rights and freedoms for citizens, irrespective of ethnic origin and religion. The whole body of legislative norms and acts and the Constitution of the Republic guaranteed all citizens equal opportunities in realizing their ethnic and cultural interests. The laws on languages, public association and the People's Assembly of Kazakhstan were adopted to ensure interethnic and interfaith equality.

The second principle was that State policy focused on developing the culture and languages of the ethnic groups. In Kazakhstan, everything necessary was done to preserve and develop the culture and traditions of all ethnic groups. There were various schools with the language of instruction of various ethnic groups, ethnic and education complexes, newspapers, magazines and theatres in various languages.

The third principle was the consolidating role of the national Kazakh language. That language was being developed comprehensively with a view to fostering greater unity of the Kazakh people. An extensive network of regional language teaching centres had been created in all regions of the republic.

The fourth principle consisted of establishing institutes and interethnic policy. The People's Assembly of Kazakhstan was currently fully functional. It was a unique institute that sought to harmonize interethnic relations. It had become a universal instrument for implementing national and religious policy, and the most significant civil society institute of the republic.

The fifth principle was interfaith dialogue. There were 3,500 religious unions of over 46 denominations in the country. Islam, Russian orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism, Protestantism and other denominations were widely represented. The State played a strong role in fostering a peaceful dialogue of religions, maintaining spiritual traditions, cooperation and interaction between religious unions through appropriate regulations.

Kazakhstan had made solid achievements in terms of preserving its national cultures in a globalized world and developing intercultural relations. It would be wise to create a mechanism within the IPU to discuss topical issues and developments with regard to intercultural dialogue.

Mr. M.V. SISULU (South Africa) said that the Special Debate was occurring at a time when the world was faced with critical challenges to uphold the fundamental principles of cultural, racial, ethnic, linguistic and religious diversity. The UNESCO Convention on the Protection and promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions had been one of the first standard-setting instruments to link culture and development. It had also been one of the first to recognize the existence of globalization and the importance of protecting and promoting diversity and cultural expression.

Amidst rising conflicts around the world, there was growing understanding that human diversity was both a reality that made dialogue necessary and the very basis for that dialogue. Each individual was fully worthy of the respect and dignity of their common heritage. They were the product of many cultures, traditions and memories. By studying each other's culture, they gained strength from combining the unknown with the familiar.

Multilateralism was the approach best suited to the modern, interconnected world. History had shown that domination was not a viable substitute for stability. Ultimately, domination and inequality led to counteraction. The construction of a new and equitable world order could not be achieved on the basis of domination of one group over another.

As a South African, he joined the debate with a particular experience of coming from a deeply divided past. The country had experienced racial repression, ethnic division and inhumanity. It had been essential, therefore, that the new Constitution was premised on the need for a united, non-racial, non-sexist democratic South Africa. Political challenges were tackled with such measures as legislating on diversity and educating a country where blacks had been non-citizens in their own land. They had worked on a document that declared that South Africa belonged to all those who lived in it.

South Africa recognized 11 official languages (of which nine were indigenous) and the usage and promotion of sign language in official platforms such as parliament, the judiciary and the national broadcaster. Their public institutions worked for the promotion of democracy and human rights and independently of each other. Nation-building and national cohesion had served as platforms for summits to foster a national conversation about the opportunities and challenges the country faced.

He underscored the fact that stakeholders, including the general public, needed a proper space to identify their interests and that those stakeholders must be open to compromise. In that way, the rights of the most vulnerable would be protected within national borders.

Mr. D. MARK (Nigeria) stated that humanity had come to understand, both by reasoning and the compelling needs of interdependence, that although language, ethnicity, culture, race, religion, gender, political inclination and economic status might differ, it was in brotherhood that progress was made. He called for the adoption of the Québec City Declaration because, although the proper management of citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural divergence in a globalizing world was an international challenge, the solutions were to be found locally.

While the IPU acted as an umbrella body for parliaments, it was up to each national parliament to put into place the legislative framework to ensure the realization of the objectives of the Declaration. Bearing in mind that every nation had its own peculiarities and challenges and must manage diversity within a local context, he said that Nigeria was currently engaged in amending its Constitution to eliminate contradictory provisions regarding identity. In particular, he focused on the issue of "state of origin", which would be replaced by "state of residence", thereby enhancing the rights and privileges of every Nigerian in any part of the country irrespective of the state of origin, language, ethnicity and religion. In addition, the National Assembly was working to ensure that women and other minority interests were well secured by enshrining in the Constitution provisions that advanced their course.

Mr. C.-H. KANG (Republic of Korea) said that his country had evolved from one that relied on international aid to one that provided aid in various areas, primarily education, energy and health. That had been achieved through diversity of faith and tolerance. Religions were practiced in a spirit of reconciliation and consideration where religious leaders often participated in the celebrations of other religions. Furthermore, it was not unusual for Korean families to be composed of different faiths. One of the greatest challenges the country had faced in moving forward as an integrated multicultural society was language. The Government needed to make greater efforts in that area and was actively examining the experience of other countries that had successfully developed a multicultural tradition.

With regard to women and children, he proposed that the IPU should take more action. He called on the Assembly to take a more forward-looking approach on the issue, one that went beyond the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians. As nothing was nobler than the conception of another human life, it was imperative that areas requiring investment for protecting the health and lives of pregnant women and children were well-funded. In 2006, the Republic of Korea had designated 10 October as Pregnant Women's Day. He proposed that the IPU begin the march of humanity for women and children by designating a similar day. His country would be prepared to contribute significantly should the IPU officially adopt that proposal.

Mrs. M. XAVIER (Uruguay) said that diversity was important for allowing culture to develop and to be able to decide how it wanted to develop. That might involve internal changes and interaction with other cultures. Culture was a common heritage of humanity and she called upon all to preserve it. As parliamentarians, legal instruments must be developed to protect it. The UNESCO convention was a good starting point but it was not binding. Latin America had succeeded in incorporating into its national constitutions the recognition of multinational and multicultural states, as well as the recognition of official languages. Uruguay, in particular, had recognized the importance of its citizens of African descent and its indigenous population. Sustainable development could not occur without the inclusion of all peoples. She expressed her support for the Declaration but stressed that it should take into account future generations and a reference to not stigmatizing youth.

The representative from the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said he wished to exercise his right of reply to the statement of the Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs. First, with regard to Iran's nuclear programme, the country was fully committed to observing relevant international conventions and was developing its nuclear capacities for peaceful purposes only. Some superpowers adopted illogical policies towards Iran and called on the country to give up its natural right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, a right enshrined in all international conventions. Second, the Minister had made reference to religious minorities in Iran, which respected all religious minorities, including the Baha'is. The Baha'i faith was embraced by a political group employed by foreign elements to implement a foreign agenda. Nevertheless, Iran respected all minorities, including Jews and Armenians. All citizens were treated equally. He therefore wished to correct the Minister and put to him the following question: why had many parliamentarians been refused visas to attend that meeting? The Minister had called for upholding the rights of minorities and all citizens but at the same time, the Canadian Government had not granted certain IPU delegates visas in order to attend that Assembly.

Ms. R. KADAGA (Uganda) protested in the strongest terms at the arrogance displayed by the Foreign Minister of Canada, who had used his entire presentation to attack Uganda and promote homosexuality. She wished to correct his statement about Mr. Kato's death by informing the Assembly that his death had been caused by a crime of passion. The guilty party had since been arrested, tried and was now serving a sentence.

As the Speaker of the Ugandan Parliament, it was her duty to protect the rights of parliamentarians and their private members' bills. The bill regarding homosexuality in Uganda was a private member's bill and therefore, in her capacity as presiding officer, she would follow the will of the legislature on that matter. The debate on homosexuality was an ongoing one, even in western societies. While most states in the United States of America did not recognize same-sex marriages, she felt that Uganda was being pushed, by the international community, into something Ugandans did not want to do. If homosexuality was important for Canadians, then Uganda had no problem with that. However, she concluded, Canada should not try to force Ugandans to adopt a similar position as Uganda was not a Canadian colony.

Item 2 on the agenda

Consideration of requests for the inclusion of an emergency item in the Assembly agenda

(A/127/2-Inf.1)

The PRESIDENT announced that four proposals for an emergency item had been submitted (A/127/2-P.1 to P.4) as follows:

- The violence perpetrated by armed terrorist groups against Christians and other minorities in Syria and attempts to drive them out of Syria (Syrian Arab Republic);
- The international role of parliamentarians in prohibiting the defamation of religions and the desecration of religious symbols and shrines by contributing to the conclusion of an international agreement on the criminalization of such acts and by recognizing respect for religions as a prerequisite for international peace, understanding and cooperation (United Arab Emirates)
- The institutional and security situation in Mali (Mali); and
- The security and humanitarian impacts of the crisis in Syria, including in neighbouring countries (United Kingdom).

The PRESIDENT informed the Assembly that the Syrian delegation had been unable to attend and was therefore unable to present its proposal. However, the Executive Committee had agreed to allow the proposal to stand and be put to a possible vote.

Ms. A.A. AL QUBAISI (United Arab Emirates - UAE) elaborated on the UAE's reasons for submitting its proposal. First, the prevalence of defamation and desecration of religious symbols and shrines caused a clash of civilizations, fostered contempt for cultures and set the stage for conflict between nations. Second, the drafting of such an agreement did not undermine the fundamental right to freedom of expression or any fundamental right enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Third, despite international efforts in the past decade to combat terrorism, ideological extremism and unjustified violence against civilians, propagation of that phenomenon would further incite terrorism and extremism and thus undermine the efforts of the United Nations and other specialized world agencies. Fourth, an agreement on that matter would put an end to double standards and promote a collective approach – already applied by certain legislatures – to criminalize such acts. Fifth, the other proposals for an emergency item, despite their importance, had already been adopted by previous Assemblies.

The delegate of MALI noted that since 17 January 2012, Mali had been facing a crisis in the north of its territory, where an armed group had perpetrated deadly attacks on the army and the civilian population. That had persisted in spite of a UN General Assembly resolution condemning the

devastation caused by such actions. Other armed groups were known to be in the territory, many affiliated with Al-Qaida, all of which perpetrated violent attacks, kidnappings and assassinations on tourists and foreign aid workers. He called for the adoption of the proposal because that matter was a threat to the entire international community.

Mr. R. WALTER (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the Twelve Plus Group, noted that although the situation in Syria had been debated at the previous IPU Assembly, the situation had escalated and had become a humanitarian crisis with hundreds upon hundreds of refugees fleeing to neighbouring States. That was now a genuine emergency and, therefore, the proposal warranted adoption.

Following a roll-call vote, the proposal submitted by the delegation from Mali was adopted and added to the agenda as Item 6.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

Final Assembly Agenda

- | | |
|--------|---|
| Item 1 | Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the 127 th Assembly |
| Item 2 | Consideration of requests for the inclusion of an emergency item in the Assembly agenda |
| Item 3 | Special debate on Citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world |
| Item 4 | Panel discussions on the subject items chosen for debate during the 128 th Assembly (Quito, 22-27 March 2013): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Enforcing the responsibility to protect: The role of parliament in safeguarding civilians' lives (First Standing Committee on Peace and International Security) (b) Fair trade and innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable development (Second Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade) (c) The use of media, including social media, to enhance citizen engagement and democracy (Third Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights) |
| Item 5 | Outcome documents of : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Special debate on Citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world (b) Special Gender Partnership Session on Gender-sensitive Parliaments (c) IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs |
| Item 6 | The institutional and security situation in Mali |

SITTING**OF MONDAY, 22 OCTOBER**

(Afternoon)

Plenary debate on the emergency item**The institutional and security situation in Mali**

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m. with the President of the Assembly, Mr. D.H. Oliver (Canada) in the Chair.

Mr. S. ARMSTRONG (Canada) said that Canada and Mali enjoyed a long history of cooperation on good governance and security. Mali was one of 20 focus on development States and enjoyed a good working relationship with Canada through multinational forums such as La Francophonie. Prior to the 2011 coup, there had been significant cooperation between Canada and Mali on matters of peace and security in Africa. The Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade had funded training in peacekeeping operations. He expressed deep concern over the current situation in Mali, especially the growing radicalism of separatist movements in the north and human rights abuses and violations against civilians, in particular, women and children, which he condemned in the strongest terms. Moreover, the situation in Mali heightened the risk of regional destabilization. The IPU promoted and protected democracy and must be part of efforts to ensure the return of stability and the restoration of democracy in Mali. In addition, the issues of regional stability and the humanitarian situation needed to be addressed.

Mr. E.H.B. HAIDARA (Mali) underscored the fact that the situation in Mali had serious ramifications for the international community. The conflict must be contained before it reached unstoppable proportions as it posed an immediate danger to the vast region extending from the Mediterranean to the Gulf of Guinea. He expressed the hope that the IPU would adopt a resolution on the security situation in Mali in order to save the country from a bitter fate. The population in northern Mali was facing unimaginable danger as justice was non-existent. Women were being raped and children as young as eight years old were being trained in warfare. At present, all democratic and cultural institutions were under threat. Mali needed help from the international community. Sanctions had worked for a while but the situation had since evolved. Sanctions needed to be lifted and international relations and cooperation re-established so that Mali could resume its course through mediation, negotiation and other means. It was hoped that the international community would support Mali and provide it with the appropriate resources to fight drug trafficking and Al-Qaida, which held sway in northern Mali.

Mr. M.S. AIYAR (India) expressed deep concern over the situation in Mali. There were essentially two crises gripping the region: the conflict with the rebels in the northern part of the territory and the broader food crisis. He called on the international community to devise a comprehensive response that included both steps to provide immediate relief to the large number of affected people and to address the region's long-term challenges of stark poverty, weak institutions and delivery mechanisms, poor capacity and low investment in the social sector. The situation in Mali was complex and entailed several interrelated problems. First, there was the issue of governance and the need to re-establish constitutional order. Second was the issue of terrorism perpetrated by Islamist radicals with links to Al-Qaida – a problem that affected both Mali and neighbouring States. Third, there was a need for political reconciliation and an inclusive political process involving marginalized groups. Fourth, the challenge that had arisen on the humanitarian front with a growing number of displaced persons. He called on the international community and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to find a broad-based solution. India welcomed the appointment of the UN Secretary-General's Special Envoy for the Sahel and worked closely with major stakeholders for the adoption of a resolution moved at the UN Security Council by the French Government.

Mr. A. MINAKU (Democratic Republic of the Congo – DR Congo) expressed his delegation's support for the resolution on the situation in Mali because DR Congo was also a State at war that was experiencing similar issues. The European Union and the United Nations needed to maintain a strong position in the region. Moreover, fundamental rights such as freedom of religion must be strongly defended and promoted by the IPU. Barbaric practices in northern Mali, drug trafficking, the creation of armed groups and the fact that the war in Mali was caused by a neighbouring country reminded him of what was being experienced in his own country and therefore, he unreservedly supported the draft resolution on Mali.

Mr. F.-X. de DONNEA (Belgium) noted that the situation in Mali was very serious. It was perhaps not as spectacular as the one in Syria, but was equally if not more serious in the long term. Violation of a State's sovereignty, of human rights, of freedom of religion and the destruction of cultural heritage amounted to an intercontinental crisis. Drugs were being routed from Latin America through ships ploughing the coast off West Africa and then taken on board flights to airports controlled by the rebels and brigades controlling northern Mali. Those drugs were subsequently taken to North Africa, Europe and the Middle East. At the same time, the bandits in northern Mali were working with other dangerous groups. Jihadists in the Middle East were joining the Mali rebels. Therefore, the situation was not a regional crisis such as the one in Syria, but one that threatened to destabilize the entire West African region, with ramifications as far-reaching as Algeria and Western Europe. Mali required not only political support but also material support to regain its sovereignty in its northern territory. It needed to rid itself of those who, under the cover of religious ideals, were nothing more than common criminals.

Mr. H. KOUSKOUS (Morocco) said that the situation in Mali was a difficult one that had arisen due to drought and underdevelopment. The situation in the entire region posed one of the greatest threats to Africa and its international partners. In addition to being a humanitarian crisis, the situation in Mali had brought into question the fundamental rights of an entire nation. The unconstitutional removal of the government, attacks on the unity and territorial integrity of the country and the recourse of the rebels to transnational crime had set the stage for a grave regional crisis. He proposed that an IPU mission be dispatched to Mali as quickly as possible to report on the situation from a security and institutional perspective. He asked the drafting committee to broaden the way security and policy matters were viewed from an economic and social standpoint. He called on the IPU to join the United Nations in helping to preserve the unity and integrity of Mali, combat criminal and terrorist networks, restore democratic institutions and facilitate humanitarian efforts. The risk of regional destabilization was high as the democratic institutions in some parts of Africa were still very fragile.

The PRESIDENT OF THE ASSEMBLY announced that the drafting committee on the emergency item would meet the following morning, and would comprise members of each of the six geopolitical groups.

The meeting rose at 3.30 p.m.

SITTING**OF TUESDAY, 23 OCTOBER**

(Morning)

Item 3 of the agenda**Special debate on Citizenship, identity and linguistic
and cultural diversity in a globalized world**

The meeting was called to order at 9.15 a.m. with the President of the Assembly, Mr. D.H. Oliver (Canada) in the Chair.

The PRESIDENT welcomed the two keynote speakers, Mr. Hendrik Van der Pol, Director of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Institute for Statistics, and Ms. Joyce Adeline Bamford-Addo, Speaker of the Parliament of Ghana.

Mr. H. VAN DER POL, Director of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, speaking on behalf of the UNESCO Director General, said that the IPU had always worked to strengthen peace through multilateral cooperation and representative institutions. Parliaments were vital for effective and legitimate governance at the national level but equally so at the international level, as platforms for dialogue and cooperation.

Globalization was opening up new opportunities for exchange, knowledge and information. Aspirations to dignity and fundamental rights were sweeping across the world, leading to positive change in many societies. But increasing contact also meant increasing points of possible friction so that while the number of inter-state wars was decreasing, internal conflicts were on the rise.

Those were turbulent times. Climate change was continuing an unpredictable march, affecting all societies. The global economic crisis had shown the fragility of all countries, and it was affecting the poorest ones the hardest. The global development agenda and the Millennium Development Goals were taking on even greater importance in that context.

The identities of individuals were being called into play at a time of revolutionary change in information and communication technologies. In complex societies and ever more diverse cities, a breakdown in dialogue and understanding was catastrophic. The challenge facing peace in the 21st century was moving from the borders between States to the streets of neighbourhoods inside them. In that context, ignorance of each other's ways and prejudice against the "fruitful diversity of the cultures" – in the words of the UNESCO Constitution – were causes of mistrust, poverty, tension and conflict.

For UNESCO, diversity and solidarity were not incompatible, indeed they were complementary. Culture defined people. It was a source of belonging and strength in a world of change. Culture enriched and gave texture to people's lives; it helped forge their identities. In a world characterized by scarcity, in that new age of limits, culture represented the ultimate renewable resource.

Just as societies were not static, culture was a dynamic, ever-evolving process where identities were increasingly multiple and overlapping. In 2001, UNESCO had adopted the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity that set out principles for understanding and managing diversity. That was a ground-breaking international agreement, which laid out a new approach to co-existence and development. In the Declaration, the defence of cultural diversity was defined as an "ethical imperative, inseparable from respect for human rights," which were universal, indivisible and interdependent. All cultures were different, but humanity was a single family, brought together by universal human rights.

The power of culture to unite had been demonstrated during the Arab Spring in 2011. The images of Egyptians of different ages and religious affiliations forming human chains to protect the treasures conserved in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo and the Bibliotheca Alexandrina were truly unforgettable.

Diversity was being exploited to exacerbate tensions, fuel conflict and violate human rights. The world had witnessed the wanton destruction of mausoleums and world heritage sites in Timbuktu, Mali. The message must be clear: diversity did not divide – misunderstanding, intolerance and ignorance did.

UNESCO promoted the dynamic plurality at the heart of modern identity and sought to build bridges through mutual respect and understanding. That required new policies of inclusion and participation that strengthened solidarity and social cohesion. It required renewed support for cultural pluralism and new forms of exchange. That included interreligious dialogue, which must be woven into the broader process of intercultural dialogue, to enhance understanding between individuals of all faiths, beliefs and convictions. Diversity was also a driver of development. Sustainable development could not ignore local cultural circumstances, or the wealth of cultural diversity. UNESCO was working at the global level to secure recognition of the importance of culture for sustainable development.

The pace of change was bewildering for many individuals and societies today. They could ill-afford to retreat into fear or to allow cultures of exclusion to arise. They must remain true to a moral compass. The dignity and rights of every individual and people must be the starting point for all action and the measure of its success. Every society must build bridges that made the most of diversity for solidarity and social cohesion.

A first bridge was the classroom. Education was a force for social change and more inclusive societies. It brought sustainability to all development efforts. There are three lines of action to focus on: put every child in school; improve the quality of education and foster global leadership. Education was, fundamentally, a force for peace.

A second bridge was cultural literacy in young people. More than ever, young people needed to be engaged. Their energy and creativity were forces to enrich cultures, drive growth and build civil society, but that required inclusive policies of education, training and participation.

A third bridge was strengthening the role of the media. Inclusive, independent and professional media were vital in order to shatter stereotypes, deepen understanding and foster a plurality of voices. For that, communication must become inclusive in access and content.

In an increasingly fragile world, renewed commitment was needed by all for dialogue, tolerance, reconciliation and understanding. Today, managing diversity within States was becoming a core issue of global governance. The dynamic plurality at the heart of modern identity must be promoted. Culture was a force that renewed humanity and expanded opportunities provided that it was not used to violate human rights.

Ms. J.A. BAMFORD-ADDU (Ghana) commented that the topic of the Special Debate was relevant in today's globalized world, which sought to enhance peace. It was important to look at both the advantages and disadvantages of diversity and how to foster unity in diversity. Human rights were protected when they were respected. Every nation would accept cultures that enhanced the lives of their people in terms of education, technology, health and other good practices. Problems arose with practices that a nation did not find advantageous to its people. It is for societies to discuss those problems and arrive at solutions.

Delegates from all over the world who spoke different languages attended that Assembly yet they were all there to seek the common good of humankind. Indeed, their gathering was a microcosm of a multifaceted humankind and nature itself. In olden times, when humankind had begun to live in communities, those societies had exploited the advantages and strengths of their distinct peculiarities to secure their survival. But times had changed. Human advancement in education, science and technology had transformed the contemporary world into an interconnected global entity. That had helped broaden their horizons sufficiently to have astute perceptions of human homogeneity and do away with prejudices against other cultures and accept wholeheartedly the diversity of humankind. Despite the many accords and resolutions adopted at the international and national levels, there were more problems of discrimination in all parts of the world. Many countries championing the cause of human rights had failed in one way or another to address their internal issues. Racial and ethnic abuses of all forms were taking on greater proportions around the world. If left unchecked, there could be dire consequences for humanity.

The modern State of Ghana was a product of European colonialism and, as a result, had over 100 ethnic groups and a vast array of cultures and dialects. The Constitution prohibited any form of discrimination and ensured that citizens were free to practise any language, culture or religion. It also entrusted a commission on human rights to investigate complaints against public officials regarding issues of administrative injustice. At the university level, it was compulsory for undergraduates to pass African studies, thus exposing them to cultural dynamics. Legislation must be used to foster tolerance and harmonize the diversity of countries to ensure prosperity. Parliamentarians had the power to influence legislation. They must all go the extra mile to appreciate cultural differences and thus build a peaceful global society.

Debate

Mr. S.N. HUSSAIN BOKHARI (Pakistan) said that it was undeniable that globalization was not without certain challenges requiring urgent solutions. Globalization had increased the points of interaction as well as friction between cultures. Bridging the gap between peoples of different regions, continents and nations had, therefore, become quite imperative in the current globalized and interdependent world. The protection of cultural, religious and linguistic heritage and identities and their transmission to future generations were not only ethical, but also legal imperatives. There was a vital need for measures to protect and promote languages of local relevance, while supporting the learning of languages which offered access to global communication and exchange of information. The key to successful intercultural and interfaith dialogue lay in the acknowledgement of equal dignity, recognition of, and respect for diverse forms of customs and traditions, and efforts to establish a culture-neutral context for dialogue that enabled communities to express themselves freely.

Being an active and responsible member of the international community, Pakistan fully supported the entire process of cooperation and dialogue among religions and cultures at the national, regional and international levels. He believed that they should strive to bring cultural, scientific and educational cooperation to a higher level in order to promote economic and political cooperation. Parliamentarians and parliaments could play an important role in promoting acknowledgement of cultural diversity and should take various initiatives to enhance intercultural dialogue and cooperation. Through enhanced inter-parliamentary cooperation and exchanges, parliamentarians representing different regions and nations could join forces to initiate a parliamentary dialogue geared towards acknowledging cultural diversity and bridging the gaps between cultures in a spirit of harmony and respect for identity.

Mr. G. NZOUBA-NDAMA (Gabon) asked how, in an age of globalization, differences – which were, in reality, a richness that should unite all peoples – constituted the motive for misunderstanding, tribalism, ethnic conflict and the negation of others. In order to understand each other, they must understand themselves. They must feel respected in what made them different, that is to say, their cultures, values, beliefs and traditions. Togetherness made it possible for humankind to achieve universality. The theme of their debate was compelling because it was so relevant today. Globalization was a precious tool for sharing values and fostering a kind of "transculturality". That notion would go beyond UNESCO's vision of promoting cultural diversity and it would develop and safeguard everything that was precious and vibrant. Thus, languages, regardless of where they were spoken and the numbers of people who spoke them, must be protected. Cultural diversity was an integral component of la Francophonie. Indeed, in francophone Africa, French – viewed as a language of culture – coexisted with many local languages. In fact, since 2004, cultural diversity had been part of the mission statement of the International Organization of la Francophonie. Gabon welcomed the place accorded by the international community and the IPU for cultural and linguistic diversity. They must scale up their efforts to consolidate gains made and explore new avenues for reflection.

Mr. K. GHELLAB (Morocco) said that the topic of the debate had forced them to reflect on the important role to be played by the IPU in developing a coherent narrative to promote common ethical values. Cultural and linguistic diversity must also be promoted as an important asset. Not only did language embody the heritage of peoples, it was linked at times with religious faith as is the case of Arabic for Islam. Language also played a significant role in promoting cultural cohesion and education and was a vehicle for development. It was a tool for cultural dialogue, friendship and cooperation. The UNESCO atlas of languages indicated that 2,500 languages had been threatened with extinction as of 2009. Others were at risk of becoming extinct. Languages must be safeguarded and used to promote common values. In Morocco measures were being taken to promote cultural diversity and ethnicity. The Constitution underscored the promotion of all ethno-cultural and linguistic components of society. Indeed, those different components were viewed not as the source of contradictions but rather as major assets. In addition to Arabic, two languages were protected by the new Constitution – Amazigh (spoken by the Berber population) and Hassaniya (a dialect spoken by inhabitants of the Saharan provinces).

Mr. N. WAIRATPANIJ (Thailand) said that globalization had connected the world and made people and countries more interdependent. No country could afford to be isolated; hence the need to ensure that cultural diversity was protected. In Thailand, a number of measures had been implemented to prevent ethnic discrimination but education and awareness were still lacking. All nations must rise to the challenge of citizenship.

Mr. A. MINAKU (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that his country was vast, with a population of about 70 million inhabitants representing nearly 400 ethnicities and speaking various languages. Being surrounded by nine neighbouring States had made the Democratic Republic of the Congo a rare country with distinct races and languages. Although French was the official language, Kikongo, Lingala, Swahili and Tshiluba were also recognized as national language. The country was also a secular state, as proclaimed by Article I of the Constitution, and therefore welcomed religious diversity. Catholics, Protestants, Muslims and other denominations lived in harmony and mutual respect. Because of expansionist ideas and a determination to exploit the country's natural resources, certain States were using ethnic groups living in part within the Congolese borders and neighbouring States to destabilize the eastern portion of the country. That posed a serious threat to national cohesion. It was furthermore an affront to human dignity and represented a negation of the universal values that were fundamental to the progress of civilization and to cooperation and friendly relations among peaceful states. His delegation called for a strong declaration condemning all forms of aggression against a Member and encouraged peaceful means of achieving peace, security and development in the world in general and in the Great Lakes region in particular.

Mr. M. NAGO (Benin) acknowledged that the link between citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a rapidly changing world. That carried great advantages but also posed a threat. The world was losing between 25 and 30 languages per year and in the next 50 years only 50 per cent of the remaining languages were likely to be used. Only the State had the necessary authority and cultural and economic clout to be able to deal with globalization and its impact on cultural diversity. Political will was a *sine qua non*. It was important to promote their cultural heritage in order to guarantee its survival. Cultural assets must be used as a trampoline to move across borders, especially for African economies. Africa needed to develop a financial plan and a rigorous development process based on legislation in order to be an actor in the ever changing world. A new legal framework was necessary to promote cultural goods while maintaining cultural diversity.

Mr. N. STEFANOVIĆ (Serbia) said that while globalization defined the current era, he wondered if everyone was fully aware of the challenges facing an interconnected world. Accepting pluralism was the answer, which entailed tolerance and acceptance of ethnic, cultural and religious diversity in contemporary Europe. The question that had often been posed was how much could cultural diversity be accommodated within liberal and secular democracies?

Certain concepts and terms occupied a central place in any debate on cultural diversity in Europe. Some of those – nationhood, citizenship and secularism – had relatively clear-cut definitions that were generally accepted by most scholars and policymakers. Other concepts such as integration and multiculturalism were highly controversial and there was little agreement on what they stood for and how they related to one another. Only parliaments represented people through democratic elections, where they had a choice to elect and be elected. Parliamentarians existed to defend the voice of the people, human rights and most importantly, democracy.

Serbia was a multi-religious, multi-ethnic and multicultural country. Serbians were proud of that fact and of their diversity. But cultural diversity, national identity or language could not be used as an argument for secession. Serbia could not and would not accept the unilateral secession of its southern province of Kosovo and Metohija.

They were living in an ever changing world, but that was not an excuse to abandon the values that made them human and connected their nations despite their differences, which were inherent to different cultures or languages. They had the ability to achieve a common global society blessed with a shared culture of peace that was nourished by ethnic, national and local diversities that enriched their lives.

Mr. A.R. IBRAHIMI (Afghanistan) said that it was their shared responsibility to stop wrong-doing and mutiny. The entire world had witnessed the cartoons insulting the holy Prophet. That had angered 1.5 million Muslims all around the world. Muslims respected all prophets and messengers and believed

that no-one should be allowed to insult them. They did their utmost to prevent the repetition of such acts as they hampered the unity of persons of various nationalities who could be brought together despite their differences.

The people of Afghanistan were the victims of an imposed war yet world leaders were certain that the root causes of terrorism were not in Afghanistan. Afghans had repeatedly declared that Afghanistan did not pose a threat to its neighbours. The country had officially recognized myriad languages. Afghans believed that language went beyond communication and was an essential part of any culture.

Mr. T.K. GEBREHIWOT (Ethiopia) expressed his gratitude for the many condolence messages sent following the recent death of the Prime Minister. Implementation of various policies and strategies had led to strong development in Ethiopia and all citizens were benefiting according to their contribution. Ethiopia had an important experience to share with regard to the topic of debate as it had 175 ethnic groups. In the past, attempts to assimilate the different cultures under the slogan of "One Language, One Culture, One Religion" had led to war and economic decline.

Citizenship and nationhood were not necessarily the same. The Constitution contained a number of provisions to safeguard rights. Furthermore, the federal system of government had provided for the self-governance of all regions. That included the right to secede from either the regional government or the Federal State of Ethiopia. The right to self-determination was a founding principle of the Ethiopian Federation and he believed that it led to peaceful co-existence.

The 21 years of experience in granting and ensuring group rights had brought peace, stability and economic growth. Diversity and citizenship were expressed in various forms of human and capital investment, where the rights of citizens were being exercised at the grass-root level. Ethiopia was currently achieving double-digit growth; it enjoyed democracy through an inclusive approach. The Ethiopian experience in citizenship and that of other countries others might well be worth considering.

Mr. S.D. DESRAS (Haiti) observed that in the second half of the 20th century, the West had created the conditions and the unique possibility for globalization. That had been done to establish a neoliberal utopia based on the free market model. Developing States such as Haiti had to submit to that reality which, ultimately, had negative effects on their economies and people.

In Haiti, citizenship had been a long-fought struggle. Haitian citizenship was stoic and being constantly redefined in the face of supranational restructuring and the conceded rights of justice, food security and self-determination. However, citizen identity, open to the world and linked to democracy, was by its very nature open to diversity.

In the beginning, globalization had been a vehicle for a unipolar world. It had resulted in a reconciliation of liberalism with democracy and had provided a framework for citizenship to flourish. Globalization created wealth but the real wealth of the globalized and interconnected world was its ethnic, linguistic, religious, racial and cultural diversity. That diversity was part of the heritage of humankind and parliaments must take ownership of the debate on diversity and make it part of their legislative priorities.

Citizenship, democracy and diversity had been affected by the race for industry, finance, technology, media, human resources and markets. The IPU provided a service to humanity by reminding all that linguistic and cultural diversity served the common good of all of humankind.

Ms. M. Mulherin (Ireland) assumed the Chair.

Mr. R.M.C. KABORÉ (Burkina Faso) said that in an interconnected and globalized world, diversity was an essential feature of societies. Women as well as racial, religious, linguistic and ethnic minorities were particularly vulnerable to alienation and discrimination based on political, economic and social considerations. Because diversity was, at its core, the fruit of democratic expression, it was their duty as parliamentarians to resolutely defend it from all threats.

In Burkina Faso, the Government had organized a forum on secularism with a view to strengthening the desire for the co-existence of the country's social, ethnic, political and religious forces. The idea was to create a republican space free of extremism. In that light, it was imperative to reinforce the judicial arsenal with anti-discriminatory measures, not only to clear the way for the full participation of women in the governance of States but also to allow them the means to achieve their full potential.

As parliamentarians and representatives of citizens, they must always remember that access to decision-making and full participation in political, economic and social life were key to fostering inclusion, tolerance, mutual respect and stability in their diverse societies. At the economic level and in particular with regard to the exploitation of natural resources, it was important to take into account the diversity of values and beliefs of social groups, and in particular ensure that the local population was treated responsibly and resources were exploited in the interest of those populations without jeopardizing future generations.

They must support the initiatives of States, international organizations such as the United Nations, NGOs, civil society and the media in their efforts to develop a culture of peace and to promote understanding and tolerance all over the world. He called for the adoption of the Declaration, which would be the crowning achievement of their Debate.

Mr. A.K. KAPERRE (Namibia) said that Namibians wanted the freedom to practise their religion openly, speak their language and celebrate their heritage without fear of reprisal. They wanted the freedom to participate in society without having to conceal their chosen cultural practices and beliefs. Cultural freedom was a fundamental human right. Equally important were the rights of indigenous peoples. In some parts of the world, peoples' cultural identities had been suppressed through cultural, religious and linguistic oppression. Parliamentarians must hold representative governments to account. It was their shared responsibility to manage common values within the increasing diversity of a globalized world.

The uprisings and unrest sweeping across the globe were an indication of people's frustration and loss of faith in their governments. As parliamentarians they must feel concerned and explore ways to enhance intercultural dialogue. They must put an end to all the senseless killing and violence. Conflicts were the result of poor management of issues. Distrust and hatred threatened peace, development and human freedom.

Mr. Y. AL-RA'AE (Yemen) commented that his delegation had been able to attend the Assembly despite the country being virtually in a state of civil war. Thanks to the United Nations and other organizations, Yemen had emerged from the crisis with a political solution that had restored stability. Yemen had been the target of terrorist acts perpetrated by Al-Qaida. Yemen respected all monotheistic religions and condemned all attacks on them. It was promoting a law that criminalized any attack on religions and shrines. With respect to the Palestinian cause, he urged the international community to ensure respect for international resolutions in order to achieve lasting peace in the Middle East.

Ms. R. KADAGA (Uganda) noted that the movement of people across continents in search of education, employment, trade, safety and security meant that some communities had to relocate from familiar environments to uncertain ones. At the international level, the United Nations and other international bodies had drawn up several conventions to regulate the movement, employment, safety and security of individuals and groups. It was important for parliaments to act on those conventions by demanding their ratification and transposition into domestic law. It was essential for parliaments to establish either standing or select committees to regularly examine, monitor and report to the House and the country on the status of citizen's rights.

No community lived in isolation and, therefore, it might become necessary to adopt regional approaches to particular issues. That would have the advantage of sharing skills, resources and experiences. Parliaments should also ensure the development and promotion of positive cultures, languages, music and artifacts by facilitating the establishment of museums, archives, libraries and the naming of heritage sites in their countries.

To support such measures, States would need to address the issue of equality by establishing equality commissions and enacting an equality law. States also needed to address the media, which had the capacity to elicit positive or negative sentiments among some sectors of society based on language, ethnicity, religion or culture.

Mr. S. HENG SAMRIN (Cambodia) said that Cambodia promoted cultural, linguistic, ethnic, racial and religious diversity. It encouraged citizens to participate in the country's development and worked to promote gender equality and involve ethnic and indigenous communities in social, economic and political life. Thousands of NGOs were currently operating in Cambodia. In addition, representatives of ethnic minority and indigenous groups took up their place in the legislative and executive branches of government.

Parliaments had a role to play in protecting linguistic and cultural diversity at the national level. First, parliaments could pass and implement laws that provided for and enhanced the effective participation of diverse groups in decision-making processes. Second, they could establish and support intercultural dialogue and cooperation. Third, they could engage and consult with civil society and groups representing cultural, religious, racial, ethnic and linguistic diversity.

Parliaments also had a role to play in international efforts to protect diversity. They could ratify international and regional agreements on combating incitement to acts of violence, discrimination or hostility based on culture, religion, ethnicity or race and monitor their effective implementation. Parliaments could encourage States, relevant bodies and the United Nations to pursue a culture of peace and tolerance, promoting interfaith and intercultural interaction within and among societies through inter alia congresses, conferences, seminars, workshops and related processes.

Ms. N.M. ZZIWA (East African Legislative Assembly – EALA) considered that citizenship could not be viewed separately from globalization. Immigrants were known to take with them specific characteristic and values to their new communities. Parliamentarians had a role to play in harmonizing such diversity in their societies. She felt that there was a need to integrate other communities based on an acceptance of their cultural and linguistic values. The IPU must play a leading role in those issues. EALA Members had a platform for discussing culture. EALA encouraged the promotion of cultural activities and the preservation of cultural heritage. Its combined territory had a population of 136 million people with different languages and ethnic groups.

Mr. S. AL-ZANOON (Palestine) commented that all delegations might not implement the final Declaration fully. He called for equal opportunities and rejected political and cultural oppression. They should highlight the important role of parliaments in implementing the noble principles stated in their declarations while rejecting policies based on religious or ethnic discrimination.

With regard to the plight of the Palestinian people, they were experiencing one of the longest occupations in recent history. That occupation served to dislodge and resettle people in different locations and evict them from their own land. It had seen the building of settlements and walls and the imposition of taxes. It had also led to an apartheid-like system of their territories, including the annexation of Jerusalem and the desecration of holy shrines, including Christian churches. Palestinians were prevented from moving freely and going to work.

He asked others to listen to their conscience when judging the Palestinian people and their rights. Palestine had requested observer status at the UN General Assembly and called on undecided States to lend their support and help Palestinians achieve and fulfill the rights that had been stolen from them in order to find a two-state solution.

Mr. P. BURKE (Ireland) said that Ireland had been changing rapidly over the past 15 years, the country having taken in many immigrants. The non-Irish national population had increased by 85 per cent. The country now had a multitude of religious beliefs and persons from almost every nation in the world. The Minister for Justice and Equality had indicated that official recognition for nomadic indigenous groups might be forthcoming. Ireland had managed to avoid the intense racial tensions that had occurred elsewhere in Europe. Its policies had fostered diversity, the State funded anti-racism initiatives and the police service had set up a racial and intercultural office. Ireland was committed to promoting human rights. All public bodies must take human rights into due consideration in carrying out their functions. Despite the dominance of Catholic Church, significant societal changes in recent years had put pressure on non-denominational schools. Inadequate government funds meant that they were unable to build new schools so a solution must be found within the existing infrastructure.

Mr. L. MOYO (Zimbabwe) said that Zimbabwe was a country marked by diversity of culture and languages. Those cultures and languages needed space to thrive and any attempt to stifle people's right to their identity was doomed to fail. Most nations were not homogenous and ignoring that was a recipe for disaster.

The suppression of the rights of minorities had led to many uprising and ethnic conflicts. Minorities and diverse opinions, if properly harnessed, could give rise to an enriching experience, thus sustaining a platform for sustainable social cohesion. All nations had experienced avoidable calamities that had been allowed to fester for a long time without any concerted effort to seek a fair and just peace.

It was easy to pay lip service to issues of culture and diversity but there were no easy solutions. There was a need for a deliberate and concerted effort by all nations. Democracy and respect for human rights were universal ingredients that would lead to a solution.

Differences pertaining to language, culture and religion offered a unique opportunity for the cross-fertilization of ideas, visions and experiences. In Southern Africa, historically, a fair share of challenges had emanated from colonization and the desire of one racial group to subjugate the other. It was now a space for a clash of ideas and visions rather than a minefield of hatred and acrimony.

Mr. M.Y. TAKHARI (Afghanistan) considered that parliamentarians should be available for their constituents and address global issues. IPU Assemblies provided one of the greatest venues for just that. The Speaker of the House of Elders of Afghanistan wished to extend its thanks to the people and Government of Canada for their military and other forms of assistance. He also wished to thank the Canadian Government for its financial assistance to the fledgling Parliament of Afghanistan. Hosting that Assembly illustrated Canada's commitment to building democracy in the world.

Mr. D.H. Oliver (Canada), President of the Assembly, took the Chair.

Mr. L. ABID (Tunisia) observed that the Assembly was being held at a time when the world and Arab countries in particular were going through a period of massive upheaval. The self-immolation of a Tunisian man had sparked the Tunisian revolution and marked a turning point in the history of the region. Tunisia was currently working on drawing up a new constitution.

The executive branch had set out to regain a certain measure of economic and social cohesion. All stakeholders had insisted on the notion of citizenship, which had been discarded for entire generations by the previous dictatorship. The legitimacy of all institutions was based on acceptance by civil society and the equal treatment of citizens. Discrimination was not permitted. Citizenship had to do with a sense of belonging to a State and identity was related to a person's sense of belonging to a group, culture and shared rituals. Therefore, identity was inextricably linked to citizenship.

National identity was being threatened in an era of national upheavals. There seemed to be a trend towards developing a global society based on one set of values, which came into conflict with local values. Transnational corporations did not understand local values, hence the need to strengthen civil society through dialogue and peace. Diversity, pluralism and understanding among different societies must be promoted. Many in Tunisia considered that globalization was nothing new since, given the country's geographical location, it had seen various changes over the centuries and globalization in different forms.

Mr. J. WANI IGGA (South Sudan) said that the 38-year-long conflict in South Sudan had not only impeded development and destroyed infrastructure, but had also greatly hampered education to the extent that illiteracy stood at an appalling rate of 92 per cent – the worst in the world. Not unlike many countries in their infancy, the issue of unclear borders had unfortunately led to a misunderstanding and clashes with Sudan. Failure to demarcate borders had been compounded by the shutting down of oil production as a result of revenue diversion and insistence on unprecedentedly high transit fees imposed by its neighbor to the North, Sudan. Owing to the timely intervention of the UN Security Council, the two countries had now normalized their bilateral relations. The library in the fledgling national legislature of South Sudan was almost non-existent. He appealed to all parliaments to help his parliament equip its library with relevant volumes and other literature.

Mr. ZHA PEIXIN (China) said that the world scene was currently undergoing the most complex and sophisticated changes since the end of the Cold War. The current trends in peace, development and cooperation were becoming ever more accentuated. Deepening economic globalization, rapid developments in science and technology and significant movements of people had made it possible to expand cultural exchanges, share knowledge of civilizations and contribute to the common development of nations. The threats and challenges posed by global issues, such as climate change, environmental degradation, energy and natural resource security, severe communicable diseases and major natural disasters were on the rise. All people in the world – irrespective of their origin, language, identity or cultural background – should join forces to address those challenges.

Nations must keep up with the tide of globalization and protect their cultural diversity. Globalization was a double-edged sword; it had brought both challenges and opportunities. One challenge was the friction among different faiths and cultures. The world was abundant and colourful and cultural diversity was one of its basic features. Mutual exchanges, encounters and a fusion of different civilizations served as drivers of civilizational development and human evolution.

It was important to promote exchanges and deepen mutual understanding. Enthusiasm and creativity should be given full play and more vitality and content should be placed into people-to-people exchanges for sustained exchanges. Parliaments had a pivotal role to play in that regard.

He was confident that by sharing and complementing each other, nations and cultures would advance their mutual development, which would ultimately lead to common development and prosperity.

Mutually beneficial cooperation should be fostered as should efforts to promote a harmonious world. That would go a long way in safeguarding world peace and common development. China stood ready to join hands with other nations to protect cultural diversity and build bridges connecting various civilizations through the platform of the IPU.

Mr. R. WALTER (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom was witnessing major change. It had moved from a one-religion State to a multiplicity of ethnic and religious groups and characteristics. Today, the United Kingdom could be described as truly diverse. However, seismic international shifts of the past decade had coalesced to reshape the face of Britain and its global policy agenda. That was, arguably, the greatest change of the past 10 years.

Shifting demographics were posing serious questions about diversity and what constituted "Britishness". That was not a recent phenomenon. The United Kingdom was made up of four separate nations, each with its own national traditions and regional political parties. Britain could never be described as a homogenous entity, it being understood that identity was a fluid concept.

Roots bound them to a historical past but they must reconcile cultural diversity with citizenship. That was a complex challenge. They must acknowledge what united them as active citizens. They must also unite in their cultural and linguistic diversity and promote the values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law.

Mr. S. BAYARTSOGT (Mongolia) stated that Mongolia had demonstrated to the world that political, economic and social changes could be carried out peacefully and simultaneously. At present, Mongolia presided over the Community of Democracies; it was committed to learning more about other countries and sharing its experience in democratic consolidation.

The most recent parliamentary elections in Mongolia had been held under a new mixed electoral system as opposed to the majority system used in previous elections. For the first time in parliamentary elections, Mongolian citizens residing abroad had been able to vote. Furthermore, election rules had been amended to include more women candidates and, as a result, nine women parliamentarians (12 per cent) sat in the current parliament.

Mongolia was rich in terms of historical and cultural heritage and its unique culture defined its people's national and intellectual identity. One of the main pillars of the State's cultural policy was to ensure equal respect for and preserve the history and customs of all Mongolian ethnicities. Mongolia was eager to learn from the wealth of the world's great cultures and was in favour of direct cultural, social and humanitarian relations with other nations and peoples. It was committed to supporting all activities aimed at protecting and respecting global values such as linguistic, cultural and religious diversity and mutual cultural understanding and partnership.

Mr. A. BOUAHARA (Algeria) said that the triumph of ideals such as dignity, justice, freedom and equality could prevail against all forms of discrimination. The IPU must consider the need to opt for a practical process that took into account all the means to promote national diversity.

Decolonization was the triumph of a colonized people. Echoing the words of President Woodrow Wilson, he said that people could no longer be dominated and could only be governed with their consent. That, in colonized countries, paved the way for the emancipation of peoples and the transition to democracy.

The current international order should be the result of the historic political, economic and social contribution of all peoples. Nations previously referred to as "underdeveloped" would contribute to a new world order that would never impose its economic dominance on others. Countries must be open to the sharing of cultures, which was a message he wished to send to all humanity. Only by knowing themselves could they get along with others.

Mr. H. VAN DER POL, Director of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, observed that the issues raised were very complicated. Culture made people who they were; it forged their identities and was based on respect and dialogue. Delegates had viewed diversity as a strong point of their society and many had given their own examples, such as the inclusion of local culture in schools in Ghana and the preservation of heritage sites in Mongolia. Many speakers had underlined the important link between human rights and diversity and development. Developments in communication had given rise to an increase in diversity. That was but one positive result of a globalized world.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

SITTING**OF TUESDAY, 23 OCTOBER**

(Afternoon)

Item 3 on the agenda**Special debate on Citizenship, identity and linguistic
and cultural diversity in a globalized world**

(continued)

The meeting was called to order at 2.35 p.m. with the President of the Assembly, Mr. D.H. Oliver (Canada) in the Chair.

The PRESIDENT invited the keynote speaker, Mr. Tau Henare (New Zealand), to address the political representation of minorities and indigenous people.

Mr. T. HENARE, Keynote speaker, said that the resurgence of Maori culture in New Zealand had been based on the economic recession of the 1980s. The collision of cultural renaissance and recession could sometimes produce odd results. For the Maori it had marked a new and exciting time of calling for justice and the overthrow of the "white man". Yet it had not taken long for them to realize that they had got it wrong – race was not about culture. Far from being simply a racial category, Maori culture, like all cultures, encapsulated a set of ideals.

The role of culture came into its own during hard times. Essentially, that was because it distracted people from the hopelessness of their situation while compelling them to become more creative, inventive and imaginative. Together with visionary leadership, they had possessed the fundamental tools to free themselves from recession. Economic recovery and cultural regeneration were thus mutually inclusive.

The revitalization of the Maori language had been forged from the old education system and remodelled to create a new philosophy. Early childhood centres focused on language development, with primary schools operating under Maori custom and language, and tertiary educational institutions, akin to universities, catering to Maori learning needs, had led to a record number of Maori graduates.

The current situation spurred the Maori to explore new pathways and the coalition between Maori and national political parties provided a unique platform for that to occur; not only because it was the mean between two extremes, but because it offered a forum to develop policy with the power to unify a nation facing uncertainty using the remedies of the past. That had required a merging of world views. For instance, in relation to recent policy statements in which some had seen just a cycleway, he had seen an opportunity for cash-poor, land-rich Maori communities to enter the tourism industry by unlocking some of the most scenic and historically fascinating geography in the country. He had arrived at the conclusion that culture had no natural political home but that it should be woven into the fabric of all ideologies.

In New Zealand, an electoral roll and seats were set aside in the House of Representatives for the Maori. The reserved seats had been initiated in the late 19th century not to enhance Maori representation, but rather to halt it. It led to an under-representation between the time of their establishment until 1996 — a period of over 100 years. The importance of culture in a country's identity was reflected in its treatment of its indigenous people and in that regard, all countries could do better. The change to a proportional representation system had been good for the Maori because all parties now represented a more accurate slice of New Zealand life.

New Zealanders took it for granted that they had the right to vote every three years and participate in democracy. The way they enhanced electoral representation, school participation or anything else was by making it exciting for participants. Politicians and political parties needed to make politics exciting, engaging and relevant. If the vision of a nation could not be shared, then it would never share in the spoils of power.

Debate

Ms. M. LOHELA (Finland) commented that they lived in a globalized world where people, cultures and beliefs crossed national borders faster and to a greater extent than ever before. Cultural and religious rights should be respected in all countries. Yet it was equally important that individual rights – universal in nature – were respected. Parliamentarians had a duty to look after the interests of their electorate and to uphold the law guaranteeing every citizen adequate living conditions and a dignified life. Ideally, equal opportunities belonged to everyone so that all had a chance to realize their full potential.

One of the major minority questions facing Europe were the social, employment and living conditions of the Roma people. The Roma people travelled long distances to beg for a living in other countries. The cycle of marginalization began at an early age, when children were left outside the school system for various reasons. People, despite their cultural background, must be given opportunities for education and social advancement and must also be willing to seize those opportunities. Parliamentarians should do their utmost to guarantee that people did not have to leave their homes because of a lack of humane living conditions or because they were the target of discrimination. Parliamentarians must not shy away from those questions because they were difficult. On the contrary, they should be working harder to solve them.

Mr. N. KYAW SWA (Myanmar) said that the parliamentary system had been recently re-introduced in Myanmar. The new President had undertaken many multifaceted reforms for which citizens were supportive. At the same time, the parliament had pursued its efforts to fulfil its legislative responsibilities. Many laws had predated the current parliamentary system and therefore did not conform to the new democratic realities. That had placed an onerous burden on the legislature as old laws needed to be reviewed, repealed and replaced with new ones. The process of globalization had been initiated because of technological advances in communication. That had led to greater economic expansion and greater mobility. Citizenship was an effective tool for maintaining law and order in a community. It was key to providing people with an identity and opportunities to live in peace, develop economic activities and participate in the political process. His delegation supported the ideas and measures set forth in the draft declaration. Parliaments must develop legislation designed to accept racial and linguistic differences. In some cases, it was important for States to continue to receive assistance from international and regional communities in order to strengthen the parliament.

Ms. M. ANDRÉ (France) said that respecting diversity required first and foremost recognition not of specific rights inherent to ethnic, religious and other groups but of equal rights for everybody within a given political system. France defined itself as a nation by citizenship and not by a linguistic, religious or cultural heritage. That was based largely on a universal concept of human rights and democracy.

Respecting diversity was important in dealing with a difficult economic situation, social exclusion and/or the marginalization of certain groups in society. She made specific mention of migrants and their descendants, for whom access to education and work remained difficult. They were often not only the victims of racism but were also handicapped by their situation. In general, situations of inequality were not only tied to an ethnic or cultural sense of belonging but to employment conditions or even relegation to particular geographic zones, where there were limited economic opportunities and poor public services.

Protecting diversity of cultural expression did not imply being opposed to the development of international cultural exchanges. Rather, the refusal to acknowledge that those exchanges possessed only an economic dimension relegated culture to something measured by its commercial success. The imposition of a culture, language or religion could only be carried out through violence, whether open or covert. Permitting the development and expression of all cultures and their language, therefore, favoured peace.

Mr. Md. A. HAMID (Bangladesh) said that the world was becoming more and more multidimensional both culturally and linguistically. Cultural identity was defined in many instances by language and Bangladesh was a unique example in that regard. Through a glorious language movement, in 1952 the nation had been able to establish its mother tongue, Bangla, as the national language. As a member of Executive Board of UNESCO, Bangladesh was making a strong contribution on the international cultural arena. It was among the few countries that promoted cultural expression through the highest legal instruments in the Constitution. The best way to promote and protect a society

was through effective dialogue and mutual respect for each other's identity, religion, culture and language. He appreciated the significant role of the IPU in working for peace and cooperation among peoples, societies, civilizations and cultures. Given the realities of globalization and the importance of citizenship, equality and diversity, he proposed the establishment of an IPU standing committee on that issue. That way, the IPU could regularly monitor related issues.

Mr. J.P. WINKLER (Germany) said that, despite all the praise for the draft declaration, the document had failed to mention protection of human rights with respect to sexual identity. In a number of States people were at risk of persecution and punishment on the grounds of their sexual identity. In Germany, various instruments existed to enforce and uphold the principle of non-discrimination. First, the General Equal Treatment Act was intended to prevent and eradicate discrimination on the basis of race, ethnic origin, gender, religion, disability, age or sexual identity. That last point, sexual identity, was regrettably missing from the declaration. Second, the Anti-Discrimination Agency helped to enforce those rights. Ensuring that national diversity was reflected in parliamentary life posed a peculiar challenge. In the German state of Schleswig-Holstein, which was on the border with Denmark, a special provision existed ensuring that the Danish minority was represented in the state legislature. The political party of the Danish minority was exempt from the five-per-cent threshold for parties to gain parliamentary representation. The same was true for the Sorbs in the German states of Saxony and Brandenburg.

Mr. J.M. GALÁN PACHÓN (Colombia) said that Colombia held high hopes that the new peace process would hopefully put an end to the decades-long armed conflict. Since the Mexican Revolution, nothing compared to the situation in Colombia and its internal conflict with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC). It had resulted in displacement, kidnappings, sexual violence, landmines and child soldiers. The FARC was amassing huge fortunes from drug trafficking and he felt that that money should be used to compensate victims of the violence. Two years after failed peace talks with the FARC, a new peace process had begun in Norway with the assistance of Cuba. The Colombian delegation informed all IPU Members that it had prepared a draft resolution in support of that peace process. They wished to put an end to the conflict and compensate victims.

Mr. G. ATAIGHA (Libya) said that following the success of the Libyan revolution, the country sought to join the modern world. His delegation's presence there was a first step, which affirmed that the new Libya had adopted citizenship as part of its progressive and modern outlook and strove to weave the mosaic of Libyan society without excluding anyone. Libya looked forward to fruitful cooperation with the international community, driven by the desire to benefit from others' experience in building a parliamentary life and a modern political experience after years of tyranny and deprivation. He expressed his delegation's profound thanks to all those who had supported the Libyan revolution against despotism and stood by their side while the former ruler waged a genocidal war against his people.

Ms. M. BONELL (Andorra) said that Andorra, a country of 88 nationalities contained within a territory of 468 km² had not only survived but thrived on cultural diversity. Over 57 per cent of the country was made up of foreigners foreign, who had come mainly for work. Diversity had enriched the country morally, humanly, culturally and economically. Hard work and an entrepreneurial spirit therefore were key elements of integration. A culture of peace and respect for others was entrenched. Andorra boasted a privileged public education system where parents were free to choose the French, Spanish or Andorran educational models. That, in her view, had led to true equality of opportunity and rights. All Andorrans were required to learn at least four languages: Catalan, French, Spanish and English. The key to Andorra's success remained its support for linguistic diversity. Hard work, conviction and cohesion had permitted Andorrans to live in harmony. It was important that the values of globalization did not dilute their identity, temperament or culture. Andorra was a space where diversity, exchange, sharing and work were the bedrock of peaceful co-existence.

Mr. P.B. SANTOSO (Indonesia) said that democracy had progressed greatly in Indonesia. It was a country that embraced plurality within one republic and continued to make great strides in democracy. Indonesia, with the largest Muslim population in the world, had succeeded in harmoniously

aligning democracy with religious and local cultural values. It also facilitated the establishment of places of worship for Islam, Christianity, Catholicism, Buddhism, Hinduism and Confucianism. That diversity in values was interwoven with the harmonious mantle of democracy.

Tolerance as a social principle must be upheld in order to bridge the differences among them. The IPU, as a premier forum for cooperation between parliaments, must not ignore endeavours to engage governments in fostering dialogue between religions and faiths, cultures and civilizations while striving for concrete cooperation in order to strengthen the foundations of peace.

The role of women must be acknowledged in the discourse on tolerance and peace, and Indonesia was committed to enhancing their role in society. The women of Indonesia made significant contributions to democracy and reform and a 30-per-cent quota for women had been introduced in parliament. Mothers were role models for their children, from whom they first learned manners and noble virtues before coming across the more complex values of society. That pivotal role must be recognized.

Mr. T. GUNGONA III (Philippines) said that on 15 October 2012, the Philippines Government had signed a framework agreement with the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF), an armed insurgent group that had waged a decades-long Muslim separatist insurgency in the south-western island of Mindanao. The peace framework would not have been realized without the facilitation of the Malaysian Government and the International Contact Group composed of Japan, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

The Philippines firmly believed that peace and prosperity could be fostered through diversity. With over 150 million ethno-linguistic groups, 171 distinct languages and more than 9 million Filipino migrant workers across the world, it was in the best interest of the Philippines that multiculturalism succeeded inside and outside its borders.

It was important that parliamentarians supported policies that would impart the values of cultural awareness and respect at an early age. By providing an education that liberated the mind from prejudice and xenophobia, their governments would come closer to creating more inclusive and democratic societies.

The Philippines was very much concerned that in other countries, Filipino workers, especially domestic workers, still fell victim to discrimination and violence. Parliaments could play a crucial role in their protection by ratifying international agreements such as the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. IPU Assemblies encouraged a diversity of ideas and provided an alternative venue for mediation. The Organization served as a vital bridge across countries even in the worst of times.

Mr. F.M. MAALIM (Kenya) took the Chair.

Mr. V.K. LIEW (Malaysia) said that cultural diversity was evident in most parts of the world. The continuous migration of workers across the globe further enhanced the diversity of nations. Nurturing and managing common values in an increasingly diverse world was one of the most challenging tasks faced by governments. In the current global village, there was a strong need for respect for diversity, without which even the slightest difference could become a source of friction between different groups, societies and even nations. Malaysia had always welcomed dialogue to bridge the differences between various groups, faiths, cultures and religions. Dialogue was the best way to develop understanding and acceptance, share ideas and knowledge and discover common ground that brought disparate groups closer. Malaysia was a multicultural, multiracial and multi-religious country that believed moderation was the path for attaining peace. Its experience in managing its own diversity had taught it valuable lessons, which lent credence to its efforts. Through dialogue, understanding and mutual respect, Malaysia promoted integration as opposed to assimilation. The real divide in the world was not between East and West, developed and developing nations or between one region and another but rather between moderates and extremists – religious or ideological. Malaysia was interested in learning from best practices with a view to improving the management of intercultural issues and countering extremism in all its forms.

Mr. Y. SIMÓN (Peru) said that the political class of Peru was deeply convinced that no man or woman should be discriminated against on the basis of origin, race, gender or religion. Peru was characterized by its ability to bring together different ethnic, cultural and linguistic groups that from the Amazon, the Andes and the coastal regions of South America. Over 20 per cent of the population did

not speak Spanish, yet government services were only available in Spanish. Peru was a nation in progress, aware that a complicated road lay ahead. Its economy was bearing fruit at the macro-economic level but that growth did not reach the lower, more vulnerable levels of society. Peru wished to promote multiculturalism among its citizens but needed sectors to manage the economy, change the mentality and to bring about an educational revolution. Thus far, efforts had proven inadequate for achieving social cohesion but the country would persevere.

Mr. I. ALIYEV (Azerbaijan) said that having citizens with different religions, languages and ethnicities was a matter of honour and national wealth for Azerbaijan. Providing equal rights and opportunities for every people and prohibiting discrimination of any form were basic principles of universal human rights. In Azerbaijan, laws provided guarantees for equality and freedom for all irrespective of ethnicity, religion and language. The Constitution prohibited the restriction of human rights, which could not be reversed by referendum.

In today's globalized world, it was impossible to envisage the protection of human rights and freedoms without parliaments. Parliaments served to strengthen democratic institutions and lay the groundwork for the enjoyment of fundamental rights and political freedoms by bringing national legislatures in line with international standards, exercising oversight of the executive and organizing public hearings and discussions. Preventing discrimination entailed more than the simple passage of relevant laws; it also required enforcement.

Mr. D. ĐUROVIĆ (Croatia) said that Croatia promoted the highest European standards with respect to human and minority rights. Minorities made up roughly 10 per cent of the population and the protection of minority rights was guaranteed through minority members of parliament elected on special lists. National minorities had a right to education in their mother tongue from primary school through university. Special attention was devoted to the most vulnerable social groups. In addition to the Office of the Ombudsman, Croatia had set up independent ombudsmen for children, women, gender equality and people with disabilities. In today's, faster, interconnected and globalized world, the challenges and opportunities of balancing linguistic, cultural diversity and citizenship were more prominent than ever in the history of humankind. Croatia had a majority Catholic population but enjoyed good relations with its religious minorities. They must not allow themselves to fall into the trap of globalization where the West imposed its values on other parts of the world.

Mr. G. VARNAVA (Cyprus) remarked that they lived in an era of intense globalization that affected society at the economic, political, social and cultural levels. As parliamentarians, they must respond to those challenges in the most responsible and effective manner, by promoting policies and legislation that supported pluralism, nurtured tolerance and fostered cultural diversity. In those unique circumstances, characterized by overwhelming financial constraints, they must work hard to promote social inclusion and cohesion so as to prevent xenophobia and intolerance and ensure stability. Cyprus, being a destination country for a large number of immigrants, had been pursuing a comprehensive integration policy for third-country nationals legally residing in the country. That policy was based on a positive approach to multiculturalism in Cypriot society and essentially sought to recognize immigrants' rights and needs and combat racism and discrimination. It was imperative to develop a global culture of peaceful co-existence. Parliamentarians should engage in an open dialogue with citizens and support the work of local authorities, NGOs, as well as regional and international networks that promoted inter-religious and intercultural exchanges and cooperation.

Mr. A. BOUAHARA (Algeria) took the Chair.

Mr. P. BIERI (Switzerland) observed that minorities existed in every country and in every society. The feeling of being different was directly linked to a minority identity. One could be part of a minority by birth right but might also choose to be part of a minority community. As experienced every day, globalization and growing mobility had made cultural diversity an indispensable element of today's society. Living within that diversity and participating in it posed several challenges.

Switzerland had not been founded by one ethnicity, language, culture or religion. It was a community of languages, cultures, mentalities and religions that had been built – not without difficulty – on the basis of voluntary affirmation. The glue that held together those communities despite their differences was the collective desire to belong to Switzerland. Apart from linguistic and cultural diversity, Switzerland was based on two fundamental values: federalism and direct democracy. Federalism was

the first guarantee of the balance between the linguistic communities. No language was considered a minority language in the country; they were all equal components of Switzerland and benefited from the same level of rights. Direct democracy, managed through referenda, contributed to peaceful co-existence between the communities by reinforcing the roles of language and politics in the decision-making process. In societies where tensions between the majority and minorities were rife, dialogue must be the preferred channel. It was crucial that different communities listen and communicate more with each other.

Mr. A. AVSAN (Sweden) noted that, sadly, anti-Semitism was still very much alive in Europe. Political parties espousing anti-Semitism were still operational while those that stood for openness were too quiet. They had to meet that challenge head-on by underscoring their contribution to the peaceful co-existence of ethnic groups. There were many cultures in the world, but only one humanity. Three-quarters of the world's conflicts had a cultural dimension. Bridging the gap between cultures was necessary for the development of peace and stability. Differences were founded in fear of the other or in misunderstanding.

To address the issue of identity, they must not only stress the need for exchange and intercultural identity but also the need for young people and migrants to strengthen their primary identity. A strong identity was essential for being open-minded and welcoming towards other cultures. Sweden had a long tradition of being an open and tolerant country, which had led to a prosperous society. Sweden was an arctic country, which meant a great deal to its people. Northern Sweden was sparsely populated, largely by its indigenous people. Their identity was maintained and development encouraged. They must focus on common humanity, which would lead to brighter future. In that time of great global challenges, Sweden and the Swedish Parliament would continue to promote an effective multilateral system with the United Nations and the IPU at its core.

Mr. D. ADAMS (Australia) stated that Australia was a modern, multicultural society that had been successful because of its stable, democratic system and strong economic development. That had been greatly aided by the recognition and celebration of diversity. At the heart of Australia's diversity were its indigenous people. It had been officially recognized that the indigenous people were the first people in Australia and the more recent European arrivals had no claim to greater rights than the aboriginals. A number of programmes, including more inclusive education programmes, as well as outreach services and social workers were trying to address this issue.

As indigenous and migrant communities had become more enfranchised, they had been seeking greater representation in all levels of government. Through waves of migration, Australia had become a more diverse and complex society, affected by and responsive to, a more globalized and interconnected world. Sustaining a fair and inclusive multicultural society had therefore become a more sophisticated exercise.

Australia was one of the longest, most continuous and stable democracies in the world. That suggested that political participation had been sufficiently strong and inclusive to enable its political system and the government it produced, to enjoy legitimacy in the eyes of the people. Australia's extensive free education system had been a major building block in its democracy. All school children had access to lesson in civics and citizenship as part of a national curriculum aimed at developing active and informed citizens. No country could afford to leave its people in ignorance as it was the youth who carried the hope of a bright future.

Mr. I. NADIMI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that human beings were defined within their culture through their language, race, nature and environment. Each culture was different from others. Various cultures, languages and ethnicities were based on the struggle for dominance of one culture over another and went against the nature of human beings. That was unacceptable. Universal human rights stood between perfectionism on the one hand and realism on the other. Nations were dynamic and constantly changing. As a nation, Iran's principles were based on Islam, which had resulted in a unique inclusive experience with various national groups and religions. Iran condemned the spread of blasphemy against religious symbols, especial those perpetrated against Islam in western countries. Using freedom of expression as a cover was wholly unacceptable. Iran would persevere in its struggle against the desecration of divine religions by participating in agreements and mechanisms based on multilateral negotiations.

Mr. TRAN VAN HANG (Viet Nam) observed that they were living in a rapidly changing world characterized by contradictory trends in which globalization, regionalism and international integration were evolving dramatically, bringing new opportunities and challenges. Globalization, on the one hand, had helped narrow geography and time, brought cultures together and promoted mutual trust while, on the other hand, extremism and uncontrolled development threatened to undermine national identities and the time-honoured cultural values of many nations.

Viet Nam was home to 54 ethnic minorities living within diverse cultures, languages and religions. It had always placed great importance on the preservation of the languages and cultures of ethnic minorities across the country. That was reflected in the Vietnamese Constitution and legal system. It gave high priority to the preservation and implementation of policies that promoted and enriched cultural and linguistic values of all minority groups.

Different and diverse identities had always existed but it was the difference in diversity that enriched the Vietnamese population. Viet Nam was committed to take any necessary action to support and take part in the efforts of the international community to ensure and promote fundamental human rights, including citizenship, identity, culture, religion and language with a view to achieving peace, stability and development.

Ms. F. DAĞCI CIĞLIK (Turkey) noted that the last decade of the 20th century had been characterized by a spread of democracy and market economies. Today, the world was witnessing a lack of dialogue between various cultures, which were attempting to divide countries along cultural lines. That trend had led to an increase in nationalistic sentiment. Muslims in western countries had become worse off since the attacks of 11 September 2001 but Islamophobia and intolerance against Muslims was by no means a recent phenomenon. He was pleased to see that a joint initiative by Spain and Turkey had been widely endorsed and had evolved into a full-fledged UN project, the Alliance of Civilizations. Turkey was aware that civilization was the collective memory of human knowledge and existence. Freedom of expression was a cornerstone of their civilization but should be applied in a manner that respected cultural and religious differences. IPU Assemblies needed to take into account its schedule of international meetings so as to avoid conflicts with the Muslim holiday of Eid al-Adha.

Mr. D. FILMUS (Argentina) said that the theme of the Special Debate was important to their work as parliamentarians, especially when the preservation of culture and identity was in peril. In South America, guaranteeing the rights and cultures of people had always been a concern. Colonization had resulted in the pillaging of the region's cultural riches and resources and even the extermination of indigenous peoples. Military dictatorships during most of 20th century had sought to destroy regional and local identities in favour of uniformity.

Fledgling Latin American democracies had had to deal with the factors of history and globalization. The challenge, in part, was to defend plurality while keeping States united. Growing globalization required a growing identity. Parliament's role was to safeguard and value internal diversity. In Argentina, new legislation had been enacted and the education system had been developed to encourage artistic expression. The country was paying attention to its indigenous peoples by embracing a plural culture and bilingual schooling. Nations must persevere in their struggle for full social justice.

Mr. D.H. OLIVER (Canada), President of the Assembly, took the Chair.

Ms. J.A. GENTER (New Zealand) commented that because she spoke many languages, having been born and raised in another country, she was a living example of the impact of globalization on her generation. The mixed-member proportional voting system had significantly influenced society since 1996. The Maori, in particular, had benefited from that system to attain a representation that better reflected their place in society. New Zealand had also begun considering same-sex marriage legislation. Proportional and fair voting systems were essential to meet the challenges in a diverse society.

Mr. M. ZIÓLKOWSKI (Poland) stated that although Poland was a relatively homogenous nation, all minority rights were enshrined in the Constitution and various bilateral agreements with neighbouring States. The treatment of diverse cultural groups scattered all over the world was but one of the main challenges facing the world today. It was a necessary prerequisite of democracy. Minorities

required equal rights both as individuals and as part of a collectivity. Furthermore, minorities might require special rights that could maintain and secure a special group identity and defend smaller groups that were in danger of being absorbed or assimilated by the dominant majority.

There was also a paradox in the expectation of minorities. On one hand, they wanted to be treated equally, while, on the other hand, they wanted to be seen and recognized as different, having their own language, habits and culture. That contradiction could result in conflicting demands. Language was of the utmost importance. Everyone should have some knowledge of more than one international language. The vast majority of debates on intercultural dialogue were held in English. A solution to increase dialogue would be to teach everyone a second language. Should they not strive to become bilingual or even multilingual?

Mr. I. GIL LAZARO (Spain) said that the debate on citizenship, identity and diversity continued to be necessary. Culture was a set of traits that characterized a specific group and gave it an identity. All cultures had a dignity and a value that must be respected and protected. Every people had the right and duty to develop their own aboriginal culture and all cultures were part of the common legacy of humanity. Every culture represented a singular, unrepeatable entirety. Caring for the particularities and peculiarities of a people favoured the understanding of nations, their peaceful co-existence and cooperation among societies with different traits.

Tolerance was essential so that diversity was never seen as an element of mistrust or conflict among peoples. The existence of differences implied intercultural dialogue, which presupposed devising ways and means of avoiding genocide. Language and religion were determining factors and stood ahead of intellectual identity. Any kind of restriction or imposition was unacceptable based on political dictates or an allegedly superior desire for territory. Xenophobic ideas were equally unacceptable given their negative impact on cultural identities. Education was key to building a better world. Educating in freedom meant educating in the awareness of diversity and the respect for differences. It meant giving a presence to others in their dual dimension of individuals and citizens.

Mr. I. MANIATIS (Greece) observed that Greece – once a country of origin for many immigrants – had become a host country. However, recent economic crises had reversed that trend and Greece had once again become a country of origin. Consequently, his delegation was very sensitive to the theme of the Special Debate.

In the past three years, the action plan for the management of irregular migration flows and the enactment of relevant laws, in cooperation with the European Union and Council of Europe, had allowed Greece to manage the issue of illegal entry into the country with respect to human rights and the law. Greece had set up accommodation centres for illegal immigrants since the living conditions for immigrants in Athens had become increasingly burdensome. Those centres had not been widely accepted by Greek citizens and politicians largely due to fear and ignorance. Efforts were being made to keep people well-informed and to restore the dignity of immigrants regardless of their colour, nationality or religion.

With respect to education, Greece was fostering a climate of intercultural communication. The main goal was to forge a climate of intercultural dialogue, respect and communication in the school and beyond, by highlighting diversity. In order to have an open, democratic and just society they must negotiate issues concerning social groups and promote appropriate legislation. The Secretariat for Equality promoted horizontal action for the employment and entrepreneurship of women and the family. Greece was aiming to dispel fear and ignorance through knowledge and understanding in order to achieve acceptance, tolerance and mutual respect.

Mr. G. SILVA (Portugal) noted that the people who made societies all had different origins and characteristics. Cognizant of the fact that contact with other cultures had an effect on individual identities, globalization was positive in the sense that it brought people closer together. But despite their diversity and cultural richness, they still considered society as mono-cultural, i.e. that there was one dominant and authentic culture. That was a narrow and unacceptable vision. He could not overemphasize the importance of education. It was the primary vehicle for helping people become aware of their roles and responsibilities both individually and collectively, as active participants in the global community. It was the only way to fight for social and economic justice and for the protection of the environment. Education fostered acceptance of diversity and it was through the acceptance of diversity that they developed an understanding of humanity and human beings.

Ms. M. ISASI (Chile) remarked that globalization had truly changed social patterns and had brought about a social agenda of diversity in States where there had previously been no space for diversity. At the same time, criticisms had also been levelled at the Internet and social networks. Globalization implied multiple possibilities that forced parliaments to reconsider their laws so as to make them increasingly inclusive. The State had an important role to play in promoting identity, equality and a space for women in politics. Chile had in its recent past elected its first woman President, who had also ensured that her cabinet was gender equal. Currently, there were only 17 women members in the cabinet. She believed in dialogue between parliamentarians and the need to move toward more diverse societies.

Mr. S. MIRSKI (Latvia) observed that the world was experiencing conflict simply because people lacked tolerance, mutual respect and a willingness to listen to others. It was unacceptable to divide the world into opposing sides; that was tantamount to double standards.

They lauded the value of democracy yet most people did not exercise their right to vote. In order to tackle that problem, the right to vote had to become a duty for all citizens. Everyone was free to choose which political party or candidate to vote for, but every citizen must cast a vote. That was one sure way of eliminating double standards in a democratic society.

People claimed to be tolerant but were not all willing to respect the beliefs of religious people. Freedom of speech must be exercised in the streets, squares and public places but not in synagogues, mosques or churches.

There was much talk about equal social rights; however, billions of dollars could easily travel across borders in order to avoid taxes, whereas pensions and allowances were cut for those who could not escape to another place. Banks were bailed out using taxpayers' money as opposed to taxpayers affected by the crisis. Those were but some of the double standards in today's world.

Mr. T. HENARE, Keynote speaker, said that the world needed a shared vision of cultural diversity, citizenship and identity. It must look after its indigenous people because they were the only ones it had. Once they were gone, they could not be replaced. Without language, culture could not flourish and it would be a sad world indeed if one of these cultures belonged to one of them.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

Special debate on Citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world

Item 3 on the agenda

Sitting of Tuesday, 25 October

(Morning)

(continued)

The meeting was called to order at 9.05 a.m. with the President of the Assembly, Mr. D.H. Oliver (Canada) in the Chair.

The PRESIDENT introduced the keynote speakers: Mr. Knut Vollebaek, High Commissioner on National Minorities, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), Ms. Meira Kumar (India), Speaker of the Lok Sabha and Grand Chief Edward John (Canada), Chair of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.

Mr. K. VOLLEBAEK (Netherlands), Keynote speaker, said that in the current globalized and ever-changing environment, some matters were still firmly attached to the sovereign territorial State, notably citizenship. Although citizens now often saw themselves as members of a much broader, global community in terms of culture, economic interests and family ties, their legal status and ensuing rights and duties were firmly attached to the State. Citizenship remained the most evident expression of a sustained legal bond between an individual and the State. It was both a stimulus for fostering a sense of belonging to a State and a confirmation of the existence of such belonging.

The evolving practices of States extending citizenship to non-residents had resulted in the granting of citizenship to members of ethnic minorities. Such an increasingly liberal attitude towards multiple citizenships could certainly help foster integration and participation. However, taken to another level, a controversial manifestation of the support for minorities abroad was "external" citizenship, whereby a kin-State granted citizenship to members of a kin ethnic group on the basis of past historic, cultural or ethnic ties. The obvious problem occurred when a person was granted external citizenship by a kin-State while the host State did not permit dual citizenship. The extension of voting rights to external citizens had given that category of citizens the power to influence and possibly determine the political course of a country in which most of them had never lived and had no intention of living. That raised serious questions about democratic accountability.

The Ljubljana Guidelines on Integration of Diverse Societies would be launched in two weeks. They argued, among other things, that the acceptance of multiple citizenships could promote integration and that children who had acquired dual or multiple citizenship at birth should not be prohibited from holding multiple citizenship over the course of their lives. Parliamentarians must look beyond existing practices and come up with innovative ideas that would help States develop citizenship policies that responded to the pressures of globalization while simultaneously upholding the interests of States and the needs of individual citizens.

Ms. M. KUMAR, Keynote speaker, said that historically, most countries had insisted on the citizenship of a single State but the expansion of laws had created space for dual or multiple citizenship. That in turn had led to the development of laws that allowed children to acquire the citizenship of both their parents, recognized new human rights standards and modified former policies. Today, it was not only common for individuals to have multiple citizenship, but the expansion of human rights had facilitated its attainment. Indeed some countries believed that dual citizenship fostered integration in the receiving community and thus encouraged immigrants to acquire citizenship through naturalization.

The emergence of supranational entities such as the European Union (EU), which rewarded citizenship, had added another dimension to that issue. EU citizenship provided supranational rights to citizens of Member States, including the right to freedom of movement and the right to study or work anywhere within the EU with the privileges of a citizen. To meet the challenges of a globalized world, they must shift from the principle of *jus sanguinis* to *jus solis*, which was more inclusive.

Citizenship had always been about inclusion or exclusion. It had been observed that women were struggling in several countries to have their citizenship valued. Formal citizenship had not been sensitive to gender roles and relations that varied across societies. Women living in minority ethnic communities often suffered double exclusion on account of their ethnicity and their gender. It was now time to transform mind-sets and usher in new citizenship laws based on gender equality.

Although it was impossible to foretell with certainty the changes that further globalization would bring, it was imperative to be aware of the possibility of dilution of traditional concepts of sovereignty, nationality and citizenship and a growing focus on individual rights. There was a compelling need for parliamentarians and parliamentary institutions to be more intimately associated with the issue of citizenship and its concomitant rights and obligations. As the highest embodiment of parliamentary traditions at the international level, she reminded delegates of their commitment to the values of diversity, inclusion, mutual respect and tolerance reiterated in the various resolutions adopted by the IPU Assembly.

Grand Chief Edward JOHN (Canada), Keynote speaker, said that indigenous people in Canada had been assimilated and Christianized. In the United States, many indigenous tribes had been exterminated. Circumstances varied largely from region to region and country to country, with some indigenous people being threatened and others recognized. In 2007, the United Nations had adopted a Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. That Declaration affirmed the rights of indigenous people to maintain and develop their own indigenous decision-making institutions. That in turn would enhance their political participation in parliaments.

In spite of that landmark Declaration, indigenous people remained excluded from decision-making on matters that had a direct bearing on them. Yet their issues should be taken into account when discussing any legislation. With regard to representation in parliaments, a quota of reserved seats was recommended. It was important for parliamentarians to be aware of international standards and ensure that all submissions to parliament of draft legislation and budgets took into account their impact on indigenous peoples. He informed the delegates that work was currently underway on the publication of a handbook, which would be launched in a few months. In a similar vein, the United Nations was being called upon to convene a world conference on indigenous peoples.

Debate

Ms. A.A. AL QUBAISI, (United Arab Emirates – UAE) said that in the past year, it had become apparent that international relations were weak in dealing with that matter. The time had come for the world to develop a new definition of new realities. Citizenship and diversity in the world today should be regarded as one subject. Discrimination still existed in some countries while others posed threats to international peace. Iran was still occupying three UAE islands. She called on the Assembly to urge Iran to seek a solution or to refer the matter to the International Court of Justice. The Syrian crisis was getting worse by the day and justified the need for collective security to deal with the problem. The continued Israeli occupation of Jerusalem was also a threat to international peace. Israel should be held to account for its actions and double standards should be dropped. She condemned the treatment of Rohingya in Myanmar.

Mr. H.B. HAMOUDI (Iraq) noted that some States had tried to gloss over diversity and impose uniformity, which had given rise to human rights violations. How could a solution be found to the challenge of unity while preserving the diversity of identity and language among people? Could they be reconciled? After the Second World War, Iraq had had to deal with that challenge. The country had inherited different modes of functioning. That had changed in 2005, when it had adopted a new constitution, which recognized the cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity of Iraq. Iraqis should be proud of their diversity, which was enshrined in the new Constitution. Indeed, all components of diversity were recognized: religion, ethnicity and language. The Constitution protected the interest of all those different components and a new commission on balance had been set up to ensure that the rights of the different groups were recognized in the budget and in legislation.

Mr. S. EDA (Japan) observed that they lived in a world with two orientations: globalization and interdependence of nations in every aspect of society, the economy and culture. He offered three perspectives on the direction that society should strive for in the future. First was a new international order through the relativity of the concept of sovereignty. Sovereignty was not to be entrusted only to States. Each citizen was required to play an active role in order to steer society in that direction. Second was achieving the international protection of human rights. It was critical for each State to protect human rights and for international human rights mechanisms to be strengthened under the relevant international covenants. The international community must establish human rights standards that went beyond the national framework and individual nations must honour them. Third was respect for diversity based on the right to individual self-determination. It was important not to alienate those who had chosen other values if that choice was based on their conviction. He expressed the hope that a common understanding would prevail, not only among the international community but also in national politics.

Ms. C. AXENIE (Romania) stated that linguistic diversity was one of the parameters that defined contemporary society. Developments and trends were complex and often contradictory. The tradition of European linguistic diversity still needed to be preserved and protected against the potential risks of globalization. The Alliance of Civilizations had been created by the United Nations in 2005. Romania had been among the first States to adopt a strategy and national action plan on the Alliance of Civilization in 2009. A political platform of support for the Alliance had been extended through direct collaboration between the Parliamentary Committee for Relations with the United Nations, UNESCO and the Parliament of Romania. Cultural and linguistic diversity and the values of humanity involved an endless range of nuances that would be discussed and included in European public policy documents.

Ms. I. HEGGØ (Norway) commented that extremism, suspicion, xenophobia and racism caused human suffering. Fifteen months earlier, a gunman with extremist national views had killed 75 people in Norway. His attack had been a direct attack on democracy and diversity but he had failed miserably. Democracy and diversity had not only survived but had grown stronger. Society must never give into division as that was a trap set by the enemies of democracy. They must continue to promote a diverse society where everyone could participate. Being a citizen was not just about how many generations lived in a given place but how they felt about being there.

Greater efforts must be made to include immigrants and their children in society. Did immigrants have a fair opportunity to work and to learn the local language? Did women get the same opportunities? The Norwegian focus on integration covered language, work and gender equality. Learning a language to get a job sped up the integration process. Adequate training and day care facilities were crucial to assisting women in accessing the workplace. Statistics showed that fewer immigrant women worked and more children grew up in poverty. Yet solutions did exist and the fundamental element was trust. Norway had one of the lowest levels of social inequality in Europe thanks to its integration policies.

Mr. J. FAKHRO (Bahrain) noted that they were living in a changing world with interdependent economic, political, social and cultural factors. They had entered the post-globalization era and were witnessing the increased development of communications and social media, resulting in the disappearance of borders that used to separate countries. Social media were turning the world into a small global village. Precisely because of those developments, a new definition of human identity was required. Full enjoyment of rights must be guaranteed in all countries. Developing nations faced a humanitarian challenge into the 21st century. Cultural, linguistic, and religious identity did not mean abandoning national ties; indeed they were at the root of that identity. Diversity gave people the ability to build the heritage of their countries and to reinforce tolerance in different regions. The world was witnessing greater participation and engagement of minorities and other members of society. Parliamentarians must ensure greater equality. Bahrain had a history based on diversity; it set a good example and was working hard to preserve that gain. He reminded delegates of the situation in Israel, of what was happening to the religious and cultural heritage of Palestine, in particular, the destruction of religious sites. He urged delegates to stop covering up the different attempts to destroy the cultural and sovereign diversity of all peoples.

Mr. A.-R. RAWABDEH (Jordan) said that Jordan was a very good example of co-existence among citizens of different ethnic backgrounds. Jordan had welcomed Chechens and Pakistanis in and granted them full rights and had provided refuge for persons fleeing other Arab countries. It had welcomed Palestinians who had left Israel because of the occupation, Iraqis because of two Gulf wars and Syrians fleeing the current conflict, but there were financial constraints. Jordan was in receipt of some aid and subsidies but those funds were insufficient and the national debt was starting to become a real burden.

Jordan was building one united society where all citizens were equal regardless of their belief or ethnic background. It had experienced the Arab Spring and had anticipated the movement by adopting reforms to address the needs of integration and assimilation. That had led to a review of the Constitution, the courts and electoral laws. Other reforms were currently underway. Citizenship must encompass both rights and responsibilities. Jordan believed in the freedom to express opinions through peaceful manifestation and in peace. Jordanians wanted to see peace throughout the Middle East. The Palestinians had suffered long enough and it was time to have their State restored in a world based on justice, freedom and peace.

Mr. P. MAHOUX (Belgium) noted that Canada had taken the lead in promoting diversity as a source of pride. Diversity was not an obstacle to individual freedoms, especially those of thought and expression. Yet some countries denied and suppressed diversity. In all our countries there were xenophobic forces that ran counter to diversity, and for whom the Québec City Declaration would be considered offensive. The world needed weapons like that Declaration to entrench diversity as a fundamental value. Belgium had adopted legislation criminalizing discrimination. It was unfortunate, despite their best efforts that they continued to talk about race. There was only one human species – that was their common heritage.

Ms. S. FORTIN-DUPLESSIS (Canada) said that the issues of citizenship, identity and diversity were at the root of what Canada was today. The country was characterized by its great ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity. Emboldened by its tradition of openness to new arrivals, Canada had found the means to encourage different communities to participate fully in a society that favoured their economic, social, cultural and linguistic integration.

Canada was known the world over as a land of diversity, open to the world, a place where welcome and inclusion were part of its roots and daily life. Without a doubt, that great diversity had forced the country to enact a certain number of measures to guarantee social cohesion within the population. That had been done largely through the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. That Charter considered all citizens equal before the law, protected the multicultural heritage of Canadians and recognized the equality of the French and English languages. It also accorded a special place for the rights and freedoms of indigenous people.

Canada was not perfect and discrimination still existed. Certain groups remained excluded from full participation in society and continued their struggle. The integration of new arrivals and indigenous people could certainly be flawed at times and debates on religious diversity could occasionally be divisive.

Managing diversity required the development of carefully thought out public policy. In Canada, that always required managing the inherent pressures and needs of one federal government, 10 provincial governments and three territorial governments. She was convinced that the Canadian model was a successful one. Overcoming the challenges surrounding citizenship, identity and diversity was not without difficulty. Given the increased interconnection between contemporary societies, the situation continued to evolve. It was the management of that issue within an ever-changing global environment that provided the way forward.

Mr. O. HAV (Denmark) opined that every individual must feel welcome in their country. The basis of development was education. Every society would be challenged by different standards, cultures and traditions, even if they were not as multicultural as Canada. Parliamentarians had to lay the foundations for bridge building. That entailed respect for other people's values. Danes believed in a diversified world rather than a unified one. A smile was the shortest distance between people. He expressed the hope that the Québec City Declaration would serve as a solid building block.

Mr. R.D. VIVAS (Venezuela) observed that socialism was an alternative to the model of capitalism which was currently in crisis. The recent electoral victory of Venezuelan President, Hugo Chavez, was proof of that. In Venezuela, democracy was strong. He expressed his delegation's appreciation to the Group of Latin America and the Caribbean (GRULAC) for allowing Venezuela to hold the presidency of the Group. He was pleased to see the peace process unfold in Colombia.

One member of his delegation had not been able to attend the Assembly because the Canadian authorities had denied him a visa because of his past as a freedom fighter. Such a flagrant example of penalizing the self-determination of peoples was a real shame. Interference or new forms of colonialism would not be tolerated. He noted that representatives from Syria had also been denied entry visas. That turn of events ran counter to the IPU's ideals.

Diversity was important to Venezuela; it served to protect the human political, social and cultural rights of all citizens, especially their languages. Venezuela encouraged multiculturalism, and had enacted special electoral measures for indigenous peoples and respect for their ancestral customs. The achievement of social cohesion required action rather than talk. He suggested that social inclusion was a better term as it implied that assistance would be provided in times of economic difficulty. Lack of empathy and assistance to persons affected by economic difficulty was precisely one of the failings of capitalism and neo-liberal practices around the world.

Mr. M. BEG (India) commented that the whole topic boiled down to the notion of identity. India had emerged as a democratic and independent State and its foresight had allowed a political identity to be established. Globalization was a celebration of diversity and a convergence of social preferences. After establishing a political identity, the economically driven world would break its shackles, jump over hurdles and unite for a common cause.

Ms. H. SILHAVY (Austria) said that tolerance, minority rights and non-discrimination were of particular relevance to a modern State. Those principles were usually set forth in a country's constitution. The Roma national minority group had been recognized in Austria for many years. The Government had enacted specific measures to support Roma children. For instance, there was a roving classroom close to the homes of the Roma and the University of Graz was involved in developing methods of teaching Roma as well as documenting five other variants of the Roma language. Within the EU, there was still a long way to go to eliminate all forms of discrimination against the Roma.

Women belonging to minority groups were likely to face discrimination and exclusion for more reasons and in more spheres than men. That usually occurred with regard to access to the labour market, education and social and health services. The most powerful equality tool was legislation. Austria had passed the Equal Treatment Act. Every two years, a report on the implementation of the provisions of the Act was submitted to parliament. Her delegation fully supported the plan of action for gender-sensitive parliaments that was to be adopted. Parliamentarians had a critical role to play in assuring that all members of society enjoyed the same freedoms and found the same opportunities in everyday life.

Ms. H. BISHARYAN (Armenia) said that Armenian society was not composed of many other cultural or ethnic groups but those that did exist were well treated. Many Armenians lived in Canada, France, Russia and the United States. Armenia maintained strong ties to its diaspora. She was pleased to state that in those countries the Armenian diaspora was able to fully exercise their rights. The discussion had addressed the importance of maintaining national identity and cultural diversity within one State but the issue should also be debated from a regional perspective.

Ms. M.J. MIGUEL (Mozambique) noted that cultural diversity comprised contradictory political positions defended by nation-States, global governing agencies and communications agencies. It should be a top priority for the public policymakers interested in conflict resolution or in development initiatives.

The Constitution of the young republic of Mozambique had striven to include elements which guaranteed the national unity of the Mozambican people. In Mozambique, being a country that had been under colonial rule, ethnic diversity had always been a controversial issue to the extent that cross-border Mozambicans found themselves in an endless dilemma because they did not know where they

belonged. The Constitution, since the enactment of several reforms, provided for one official language, Portuguese, but respected the other local languages and variant languages of the ethnic groups and regions. At the national level, a bilingual education system had been developed to promote, respect and stimulate the learning of local languages. Nations must look to their past, rethink their values, acknowledge and get rid of many preconceptions and outdated opinions, which had often been formulated without consultation. The time had come for a paradigm shift.

Ms. B. CONTINI (Italy) observed that the whole world was lagging behind both in solving and facing the dilemma of cultural diversity versus globalization. That was because globalization had always been considered an essentially technological and economic issue. Only lately had the human, cultural, social and institutional challenges of globalization emerged. Intoxicated by the economic advantages of globalization, the world had waited too long to face the consequences of its human, social and cultural impact.

The time had come to recognize that tradition could not be solely seen as a link to the past because the history they were all part of had not started and would not end with them. Their successors would view their current way of life as their own tradition, their link to a background that was yet to come. Reconciling individual cultural identities in an era of globalization meant building a future where several voices could be heard. That was the political challenge of the century: they should take the globalization process into their own hands again rather than leave it to technology and the economy. If they were successful, they would build a world where different backgrounds and cultures could co-exist in an ongoing dialogue, for the benefit of all the world's peoples.

Mr. R. PEZ FERRO (Cuba) concurred with other delegations in protesting against the issue of visas. Any Member of the IPU who had proposed to host an Assembly must sign a protocol and seal its commitment to allowing all Members to participate. Failure to respect the protocol should lead to the cancellation of the Assembly. His delegation had received the necessary visas two days before the start of the Assembly. They had been told that all members would get visas, which had not been the case.

Cuba's war of independence had been a culmination of the struggle for diversity by unifying for one goal. Cuba was a multicultural country with many religions. Respect for cultural diversity was a cornerstone in developing diversity and a strong identity. Parliaments could play a crucial role as long as they did not give in to the whims of the media. They must respond to the aspirations of most citizens, which was to live in peace. Dialogue was the main path to resolve differences at the national and international levels.

Mr. F. BUSTAMANTE (Ecuador) said that Ecuador had recently had to face the issue of diversity. The country recognized certain universal principles while emphasizing the need to give full space and respect to differences. Ecuador was a nation composed of different cultures; it had established the principle of "interculturality", which went beyond tolerance and diversity. It represented the enrichment of each component of society. Culture was expressed in practice, through everyday habits and gestures. Ecuador was for universal citizenship, whereby all inhabitants must have citizen rights. Such rights, which included electoral rights, were extended to non-nationals living in Ecuador. He believed in human mobility on a universal level and doing away with visas for all, with only a few exceptions. There was a need to set minimal goals and rules that guaranteed the right to diversity but respected national laws that prohibited certain practices. For example, the laws of certain indigenous people in Ecuador provided for corporal and physical punishments. Was that reconcilable with national law?

Mr. R.W. PANKA (Suriname) stated that Suriname was a small country built on mutual respect for the various cultures of which it was composed. Tribal and indigenous communities were represented in all spheres while the Constitution prohibited discrimination of any kind. Surinamese put their differences aside and looked towards the more important things in life. Diversity provided an opportunity to develop economies whereas focusing on differences hampered growth. Politics was about looking for peace and finding solutions whether they existed or not. He advocated practising good citizenship.

Mr. F.M. MAALIM (Kenya) commented that independence had been achieved to correct the ills of colonialism. In colonial times, Africans were called natives and savages, in short, sub-humans. Now others ills existed, such as tribalism and ethnocide, the latter being one form of genocide. Indigenous people had suffered discrimination all over the world and Kenya was no exception. Africa had inherited the colonial legacy of tribalism, where the notion of "divide and rule" was still alive. Unfortunately, despots had taken advantages of that fact. In addition to diversity, there was also the issue of land rights, where African elites took over lands that were not rightfully theirs. Some form of redress was needed.

With regard to citizenship, there had been instances where even heads of States had been declared non-citizens. That was not unusual in Africa. The international community, the IPU, the parliaments of the world and the United Nations must take action and establish a basic set of standards for every country to conform to as a prerequisite for being recognized as a member of the civilized world of today.

Extremists existed everywhere as a result of having been marginalized, discriminated against and being placed on the periphery. The IPU must deal with that question on a regional basis. Indigenous people in Africa had lived in peace for centuries. They had preserved the wildlife and the environment. It was only with their displacement and the arrival of a privileged class that the land and culture had suffered indignities.

Mr. D. DAUBNEY, Penal Reform International, noted that minorities were overrepresented in the prison population. At the same time, the proportion of women prisoners from ethnic and racial minority groups and indigenous women was increasing. In many countries women from ethnic minority backgrounds were much more likely to be imprisoned, and indigenous women in prison mostly came from particularly disadvantaged circumstances. In their quest to access gender- and culture-relevant rehabilitation services, education and work programmes, women prisoners faced multiple forms of discrimination. Stigmatization of indigenous women was particularly marked following their release and they tended to be rejected or ignored by their communities, which increased their likelihood of re-offending.

On behalf of Penal Reform International, he called upon parliamentarians to take the needs of that particularly marginalized group into account in their debate at the Assembly and their work at the national level. He suggested that a future IPU Assembly should dedicate a special debate to the issue of women's access to justice, including the perspective of discrimination against women in criminal justice systems. In order to support such a discussion, his organization had made available a briefing on discrimination against women in criminal justice systems in various languages.

Mr. J. HORVÁTH (Hungary) said that in the Carpathian Basin, Catholics lived among Jews, who lived among Protestants. The first laws of religious tolerance had been developed there over 500 years earlier. They had been developing a culture of co-existence for centuries. Hungarian society had been enhanced rather than diminished because of inclusiveness. Hungary practised inclusive integration, not assimilation.

The Québec City Declaration confirmed that the multiple colours of their culture were reflected in the universal values of humankind. They must work to safeguard that value. It was important to do so because over history, that value had come under attack. During the Second World War, thousands of inhabitants of the Carpathian Basin had been forced to march to their death because of their religion. Others had been expelled because of their language. The Declaration was a breakthrough because it referred to citizenship as a concept that served rather than bound people. Citizenship existed for the sake of the people, not the other way around.

Mr. A.A.E.T. ABD EL SALAM (Egypt) stated that Islam made no mention of racial discrimination. Islamophobia was the result of distortions in the media. Islam was a religion of peace and truth. They had all been created from a single pearl: Adam and Eve, and had been made into tribes and nations. Cultural diversity was globalization at its best. Even in the earliest days of Islam, there was cultural diversity. Egypt reflected on its cultural diversity. Irrespective of religion, they were all brothers and sisters in humanity, equal as the teeth in a comb. The Holy Koran made mention of Islam

and other religions. Lastly, with regard to the issue of visas, it was important to make a distinction between government and parliament. Parliamentarians should not be blamed for the action of governments.

Ms. V. PARKANOVÁ (Czech Republic) observed that, on the one hand, the State was obliged to protect diversity, while on the other it must also seek social cohesion. The integration of various minorities was possible only if common ground could be found. Instead of fighting diverse identities, countries should focus on support or at least acceptance of cultures that did not impede integration. It was feasible to incorporate minorities into society and at the same time increase their political participation in governance.

Ms. A. RAMIREZ NAVA (Bolivia) commented that Bolivia was currently working on a revolutionary process led by civil society. Having given rights to indigenous peoples, State administration was being affected and indigenous people were now involved in State affairs. Since 2006, all indigenous peoples had been involved in decision-making processes. Bolivia was now building a citizenship based on rights, the power of social movements and elections to the legislative and legal branches. It was seeing general assemblies of agrarian groupings, unions of owners and of indigenous groups. The country was effectively engaged in a decentralization of its structures. That had led to radical change in political power and how it was exercised in Bolivia. The dominant classes had been destabilized and were losing power. Twenty years previously discrimination had been rife under the influence of colonialism but a new constitution passed through a referendum in 2009 had brought about many changes. One such change was the move towards a multicultural and multi-ethnic State. The traditional concept of recognizing people as individuals had changed. Individuals were part of a community or group. Significant progress had been made in recovering the culture lost due to the country's recent past. Bolivians were all part of a civil citizenship tied to freedom, property rights, political rights, social organization and social awareness. Citizenship equalled a minimum level of economic and social security. That was achieved by sharing the common wealth and establishing standards for all. Bolivia wished to be a full-fledged member of the world community based on its new identity. Its main goal was for all States to include in their legal structures the right of their indigenous peoples to be recognized as full-fledged members of society.

Ms. M. VAN EETVELDE (Belgium) noted the importance of linking integration to migration and considering political and administrative decentralization. First, current migration trends pointed to the economic interdependence of labour and capital beyond borders. But political and religious persecution or climate refugees had resulted in countries having to face the reality of making room for those new arrivals in society. In the Flanders region, there was an active policy of language courses and professional training and teaching about the social and political structures of the State. It was felt that those who mastered the language of the new home State would be able to actively and fully develop a civic identity. In States where different languages and cultures cohabited; the granting of regional autonomy to diverse populations might contribute to the development of the whole country by facilitating the peaceful co-existence of different cultural and linguistic groups. A political and administrative authority that was close to the citizenry but that also sustained education, culture and language was of capital importance.

Mr. D.P. O'CONNOR (New Zealand) said that New Zealand's European forefathers had had the foresight to formalize the rights of indigenous peoples. That was still in effect today. New Zealand had assumed a moral and political responsibility to sustain the development of smaller countries. For instance, many Asian countries faced challenges in reconciling development with environmental protection. Different health standards and educational outcomes were related to cultural background. There was still much work to do.

The link between economic disparity and human suffering was clear to New Zealand, which was committed, through international efforts, to bridge the gap. They must seize the opportunity to fight discrimination and build a world of equality. Words and resolutions would amount to nothing without a commitment to return to parliament and enact relevant legislation.

Lord FAULKNER of WORCESTER (United Kingdom) said that Britain was increasingly a multi-ethnic and diverse community. The recent Olympians, of diverse backgrounds, had won the heart of the whole population. It is up to both Houses of Parliament to ensure that ethnic and cultural diversity was represented. They still had a long way to go. The 2010 election had returned a record number of visible minorities to parliament but there was still room for improvement. In the House of Lords, new appointment arrangements had helped to address gender balance and should be developed to enhance the presence of peers from diverse ethnic groups and disabled peers. Indeed, the Upper House could reflect minority interests and, through a thoughtful appointment process, could address those issues.

Mr. M. JAGANNATH (India) said that globalization presented both challenges and opportunities. Multifaceted as it was, globalization had seen the emergence of global markets, diversity and other social consequences. Varying degrees of ethnic, linguistic, social and cultural diversity were inherent to every society. India was one of the most religiously diverse countries in the world, which had brought with it linguistic and cultural diversity. The 1991 population census had shown that 114 languages were spoken by at least 10,000 people in the country and 22 languages were spoken by more than 1 million people. The Constitution of India was crafted in such a way as to promote a strong and united country while simultaneously affirming respect for diversity. In all the conflicts the Indian State had faced, what has stood out was its willingness to accommodate diversity. That quality had enabled it to remain strong and unified as a whole. In promoting and preserving diversity, parliaments must take the lead in managing and building common values while promoting diversity in a globalized world. Diversity must be carefully balanced with social cohesion within the framework of international law and standards so that social justice, cooperation and peaceful co-existence could thrive.

Ms. M. MULHERIN (Ireland) said that it was important to recognize that it was difficult to be a voice for millions of people all at once. How could people be heard as individuals and not as a mass? Representatives could be chosen to articulate the needs of different groups, each with a unique identity. Cultural diversity represented various groupings and peoples. Culture was a form of language. It was crucial in representing the minority to the majority. Consequently, efforts must be made to protect unique languages. If people were to continue to contribute to the wealth of humankind, they would need a free platform to express and share their wisdom and outlook on life. Her delegation endorsed the general ethos of the Québec Declaration but felt that they needed to go a step further.

Mr. M. RAVIGNAT (Canada) said that any consensus based on ethnicity, race, language or other was the result of the dialectic of power. Canada had and continued to suffer the consequences of that dialectic between political forces of diversity and those of centralization. The temptation to use seeds of divisions to gain political power was as alive today in Canada as it had ever been and no country, political party or government was immune to that temptation.

Parliamentarians must ensure a place for diversity if they were to successfully navigate nation-building. No one could tell another exactly what had contributed to his or her sense of identity. Parliamentarians, therefore, must allow the people they represented to teach them what it meant to be them.

In Canada, the vitality of minority communities was more fragile than ever. That was particularly true for Francophones living outside the province of Québec and for indigenous peoples. The lack of vitality necessary for cultural survival was especially striking for Canada's indigenous people who, despite being one of the most rapidly growing populations, were culturally and linguistically in jeopardy. The meaningful inclusion of indigenous peoples in the shared political, legal and economic life was Canada's greatest challenge of the century. The level of political participation of indigenous people in Canada remained too low.

Still, there were many aspects of the Canadian model and its constitutional and legal framework that could be useful as best practices for emerging States with a diverse population. Canada had taken several positive steps and was being more proactive in its promotion of diversity. Although it was important to create a legal framework to protect certain collective rights, that could only create a certain level of social cohesion. It was important to monitor and provide funding to ensuring the vitality of communities through research and evidence-based public policy.

Mr. A. YUSUF ALI, Association of Senates, Shoora and Equivalent Councils in Africa and the Arab World (ASSECAA), said that poverty was the root of all evil. Everyone needed to be aware of the causes as well as the symptoms of the lack of peace, security and stability in the world. People were crying out for justice and equal rights. They must be guided by the principle of "do unto others as you would have them do unto you". They should aspire to live in a peaceful and prosperous world where all individuals are treated as citizens and free to move about in the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. I. NADIMI (Islamic Republic of Iran), in exercising his right of reply, stated that Iran wished to protest against the baseless remarks made by the delegate of the United Arab Emirates. It was the Zionist regime, equipped with hundreds of nuclear warheads, which posed the greatest threat to the Middle East and Persian Gulf countries. The United Arab Emirates were interfering in Iran's internal affairs by questioning its territorial integrity. The three islands in question had belonged to Iran for over a thousand years and the UAE had only claimed them recently. Good neighbourliness was needed to further the interests of Islam. He expressed the hope that the UAE delegation would refrain from making such comments in the future since those three islands would always belong to Iran. Such remarks were of no benefit to mutual regional interests.

Mr. K. VOLLEBAEK, Keynote speaker, noted that many interventions had expressed a strong willingness for inclusion. He recalled that in two weeks' time, the Ljubljana Guidelines on Integration of Diverse Societies would be launched. Those Guidelines recognized that citizenship belonged to residents even if they held the citizenship of another State. They called for the acceptance of multiple citizenship as restrictive citizenship policies ended up being barriers to integration. He called on parliamentarians to develop appropriate policies.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSEMBLY admitted he had been impressed with the quality of the interventions as they had emphasized the wide range of experiences with diversity, from the moderate to the extreme. The range of definitions of culture, diversity and citizenship further emphasized the fluidity of those concepts. Many speakers had underscored that diversity was a source of strength for societies, which had been amplified by contemporary migration patterns. Many participants had noted the important role of parliaments in protecting diversity, enhancing tolerance and fostering dialogue. A range of tools was being applied to protect pluralism and promote mutual understanding, including constitutions, education, language rights and electoral systems. Given the breadth of the subject matter, their debate had merely scratched the surface of diversity in an age of globalization. He would leave with the assurance to overcome the challenges that lay ahead and convinced of the value of such exchanges.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs**Sitting of Monday 22 October**

(Afternoon)

The meeting was called to order at 2.40 p.m. with Mr. M. Traoré, President of the IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs, in the Chair.

Adoption of the agenda

(UNC/2012/A.1)

The CHAIR asked whether the agenda could be adopted.

It was so decided.

Session I: Roundtable discussion: Multilateralism and the role of parliamentary diplomacy

The CHAIR introduced the Moderator of the session, Mr. N. Evans (United Kingdom)

The MODERATOR informed the delegates of how the roundtable would proceed.

Presentation

The CHAIR said that parliamentary diplomacy was understood to be "the actions of parliaments in the international arena, the goals that these parliaments seek to achieve, the approach the parliaments adopt, the content of these interventions, the results of these interventions and the scope of these interventions." It was clear that the various parliaments were playing a diplomatic game. When parliament took action, there was no option but to include it in the sphere of public policies.

Parliamentary diplomacy had become an essential element. Today, even the United Nations emphasized the role of parliamentary mediation. Special considerations arose when parliaments became involved in mediation, crisis management and facilitation.

Mediation could be used during serious crises such as civil war or frequent disputes such as those between farmers. Regardless of the level of crisis, parliamentary mediation could play a role.

Parliaments had been involved in various crises. The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Parliament, for example, had been involved in the crises in Niger and Guinea. The Parliament had taken a consistent stand; it was as a result of ECOWAS' actions that the initial meetings between the groups had taken place.

Another example was the Inter-parliamentary Committee of the West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU), which had become involved at the very beginning of the crisis in Côte d'Ivoire, had sent field missions to the country and had established a special Inter-Parliamentary Council for Peace. Its mandate was to assess potential crisis situations, endeavour to anticipate them before they occurred and, once they did erupt, play the role of facilitator, knowing that that would involve diplomacy and support. That type of diplomacy did not take the place of State diplomacy. The WAEMU had also been involved in several other crises. There was potential for regional parliaments too.

He then asked the participants to consider the following questions and use them as a basis for their ensuing discussion: What was the comparative advantage of parliamentary diplomacy over State diplomacy? How could parliaments justify intervening in an arena, which had traditionally been the monopoly of the executive? Nowadays, modern States no longer had a centralised executive. What were the strengths and weaknesses of parliamentary diplomacy? What key roles and responsibilities were involved in parliamentary diplomacy? What forms did parliamentary diplomacy take?

The goal of that exercise was to share ideas and good practices that could be used by national and regional parliaments. They must consider the implications of parliamentary diplomacy in terms of the responsibility of parliament. In addition, they must ensure that they had the necessary organisational tools, such as training, financial support and equipment.

The MODERATOR thanked Mr. Traoré for his comprehensive presentation. He indicated that such forums provided a golden opportunity for parliamentarians to exchange ideas and views and discuss issues they might not necessarily agree on. Such debates enabled a better understanding of many issues and were thus very valuable.

Debate

Ms. M. ZZIWA NANTONG (East African Legislative Assembly – EALA) informed the delegates that EALA was a regional parliament made up of five republics: Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda). It had been established in 1999 under treaties that were now part of its Constitution. The Assembly adhered to the fundamental principles of democracy.

As a parliament, EALA was involved in multilateral exchanges; it was made up of countries that had a lot in common: geography, culture and economic interests. Its member parliaments and multilateral relations were guided by the principle of good governance.

In certain situations, multilateral relations could become unbalanced, mainly because of differences in demands and expectations. It was a well-known fact that some of EALA's members did not adhere to democratic values. EALA sometimes had to remind its member countries that they were signatories to international treaties and must thus respect them.

When a Member was in the throes of an electoral process, other Members were sent for support. When some Members were not acting in line with democratic principles such as accountability, transparency and social justice, EALA passed motions or resolutions intended to support and remind them of their important commitment to the values of the Assembly.

EALA encouraged a common understanding of issues in order to present a common East African position. Members tended to adopt a similar position on development-related or economic issues. However, on issues related directly to governance, such as political parties, press, the media, and other fundamental questions, the Assembly moved cautiously to advise the Member to reconsider its position. EALA's initiatives had often been successful.

Some of its Members had had some issues with neighbouring States that were non-EALA members. The Assembly had used available resources to mediate with countries outside the organization and the results were encouraging. That topic was very important. Parliaments must ask themselves if they were efficient in terms of input and support. In some instances they were not, for example, they did not have the mechanisms to veto a government that was not acting according to its rules.

Mr. R. MIGLIORI (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) – Parliamentary Assembly) said that their presence today demonstrated that a multilateral approach was important to respond to international challenges. The OSCE had been created during the Cold War at a time of uncertainty in Europe. The intention had been to create a sense of stability. Of its 56 member countries, some still had unresolved conflicts. The OSCE Parliament wanted to promote dialogue so as to help resolve conflicts and find solutions. Governments or parliament could not do their work alone. They needed to develop joint projects and initiatives. The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly wanted to promote reconciliation and cooperation. Not all challenges were direct conflicts. Urgent action was also needed on climate change and food security

Neighbouring countries should be able to work together with shared agricultural, economic and regional interests. Governments had the ultimate responsibility for negotiating peace settlements but parliamentarians too had an important role to play in establishing relations with other countries.

Mr. J. CHAGNON, President of the National Assembly of Québec and President of the Confederation of Parliaments of the Americas (COPA), said that he believed that parliamentary diplomacy was extremely important; it was a natural extension of their responsibilities as representatives of the people.

Several key principles had guided his vision of international and inter-parliamentary relations. The legislative process forced parliament to take the State's international relations into account, such as the process of ratifying certain international commitments. The stakes forced them to pay attention to what was happening beyond their borders. Issues such as immigration, climate change and international trade are always taken into account in the work of our parliamentary committees.

As parliamentarians, they enjoyed freedom of speech and a certain degree of independence, which brought them closer together. That shared culture allowed them to address topics and grasp issues more directly and with greater flexibility, without the traditional protocol imposed by State diplomacy. They could take advantage of a favourable environment to avoid conflict or to facilitate their resolution.

COPA was celebrating its 15th anniversary that year. Parliamentarians were striving to establish a community of the Americas that embodied the principles of respect for human dignity and human rights, peace, democracy, solidarity among peoples, social justice and gender equality. COPA was the only parliamentary organization in the hemisphere to include in its membership the congresses and parliamentary assemblies of unitary, federal, federated and associated States as well as regional parliaments and inter-parliamentary organizations. Since 2005, COPA had led 13 electoral observation missions in 10 countries. COPA had adopted parliamentary democracy criteria and a self-assessment tool for use by the parliaments of the Americas. The organization had also adopted resolutions on political crises situations that sometimes involved the region. Dialogue was the preferred conflict-resolution approach.

COPA regularly addressed social issues such as infant mortality, education and gender equality. Parliamentarians could take advantage of the opportunities presented by parliamentary diplomacy to influence international law. COPA and other inter-parliamentary organizations faced numerous challenges. The world had witnessed a trend towards a growing imbalance of power in favour of the executive, at the expense of the legislative branch. They must continue to establish channels of communication between those two powers and to make their positions known in many forums. Their organizations must work together not compete against each other. They were all working towards common goals.

Given its international impact, parliamentary diplomacy complemented the work of governments. It democratized and strengthened State diplomacy and enabled parliamentarians to expand their contacts and broaden their networks. Because of its independent, multiparty nature, parliamentary diplomacy was unique and indispensable.

Mr. R.M.C. KABORE (Assemblée parlementaire de la francophonie – APF) said that parliamentary diplomacy had a very important role to play in today's world. The APF was composed of 78 sections that were part of the Asia-Pacific region, the Americas, Africa and Europe. It offered its constituency many opportunities to share experiences and was committed to defending cultural expression. Its role was to monitor situations that could be resolved or find solutions by sharing experiences. It responded to issues of conflict and strengthened the bonds of friendship and fraternity. The APF's priority was cultural and linguistic diversity. That goal drove its various forums and discussions.

Parliament must be able to be kept informed of the various issues affecting the country. Parliamentary diplomacy played a somewhat limited role in conflict resolution. Parliamentary diplomacy complemented State diplomacy. However, it would be a good idea to codify the areas in which parliamentarians must work and could be involved, so that everyone abided by a code of conduct.

Mr. M.E. KILIC (Parliamentary Union of the Organization of the Islamic Conference Member States – PUIOCM) said that PUIOCM was composed of 52 Member States and was different from regional organizations in that it encompassed three different geographical groups: Asia, Africa and the Arab world. The organization promoted dialogue and good relations between Member States, mainly on political, economic and cultural issues.

Many thorny issues had been successfully resolved through dialogue and negotiation – the basis of parliamentary diplomacy. He asked how parliamentary diplomacy could play a role in multilateralism. There was a growing need to establish global organizations and bodies to serve common objectives in all domains. Such groupings sought to enhance cooperation among member in several areas.

It was expected that parliamentary diplomacy would play a role under the umbrella of multilateralism. Yet there were many problems with parliamentary diplomacy. The main problem, in his experience, was the limited power of parliaments over the executive. In some cases where there were stronger parliaments, there were conflicts of authority.

Ms. S. RAFI (Parliamentarians for Global Action – PGA) said that her organization used a very different sort of parliamentary diplomacy. It was the first parliamentary non-governmental organization (NGO) specifically set-up as an instrument of parliamentary diplomacy. It had been established in 1978 by two Canadians. Their goal had been to create an organization that would infuse both activism and a goal-oriented legal order through the multilateral system.

The organization had been setup specifically to use the multilateral system to get agreements in lobbying, the treaty mechanism and the convention mechanism on specific issues. The PGA had been established as an NGO. In addition to working with like-minded governments and with the UN system, it also worked in tandem with issue based NGOs such as Greenpeace.

It was a movement of citizenry able to interface, prompt and influence decisions at the international level. PGA also worked with a host of other organizations. The organization took the overall goals of the multilateral system – peace, social progress, rule of law – and used them to put forward treaties, conventions, ratifications and implementation.

In 1989, the organization had re-launched work on the International Criminal Court (ICC) through a United Nations resolution. The resolution had been proposed by Trinidad and Tobago. Within four years it had engaged a very strong movement of human rights defenders, human rights NGOs and like-minded governments and had pushed forward a ratification process of the Statute of the ICC, whereby 60 countries joined the ICC.

More could be done, especially through the IPU in the areas of development and women's empowerment. There were conventions and platforms of action, but they still were not legally binding. The IPU could play a significant role by bringing those organizations and their issues forward.

She concluded with a plea for a Pakistani girl who was fighting for her life because she had stood up and demanded an education. She needed the international community of parliamentarians to stand up with her to isolate, disarm, disown and stop funding this ideology of hate and extremism disguised as religion. The strongest message that parliamentarians could send was an affirmation of the right of girls and women to education and empowerment.

Mr. R. HASANOV (Parliamentary Assembly of the Turkic-speaking Countries – TURKPA) explained that the members of TURKPA were Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkey. The umbrella organization was based on the historical, cultural and linguistic unity of Turkic-speaking countries. The countries had developing economies and dynamic populations. One of the goals of the organization was to enhance cooperation among Turkic-speaking States.

TURKPA held a plenary session once a year. It had four special permanent commissions, which also convened once a year. Since 2010, elections had been held in the four member countries and monitored by TURKPA and international organizations.

The Assembly was firmly committed to the principles and the upheld by the United Nations and its Charter, as well as universally recognised principles and norms of international law.

Although the organization brought together a particular group of countries, it does not take an exclusive approach. Its members sought to establish and develop relations with other national parliaments and international organizations. It was important to establish a common parliamentary platform for dialogue at the global level.

TURKPA had been granted observer status with the IPU and other international organizations. Parliamentary diplomacy was considered as complementing traditional diplomacy and was contributing to political and social dialogue and an exchange of views at various levels.

Mr. S. AL SHAMMARI (Transitional Arab Parliament) said that the Transitional Arab Parliament comprised 88 members from 22 Member States, all Arab League countries. Each State was represented by four members elected by their national parliament. Under the new system, a new member would elect members directly to the parliament. Through an electoral system in place in each Member State, the Transitional Arab Parliament endeavoured to exercise oversight of the national parliaments. The members had language, religion and geography in common. Another organization, the Arab League, also brought together Arab States. It was in that framework that the General Secretariat of the Arab League and the Arab Parliament had been created. It was hoped that in 2013 an Arab Court of Justice would be established, thus equipping the Arab world with all the necessary institutions. As such, Arab countries would be well organized by clearly-defined working modalities. The Arab Parliament was transitional and the seven-year transition period would come to an end in late 2012. In 2013, a new permanent Arab Parliament should be created, bringing together all Arab countries. That body would have clearly-defined prerogatives and would exercise oversight of all Arab States, the Arab League

and the regional organizations working under the umbrella of the Arab League. In addition, the new parliament would oversee the budget process, the work, activities and legislative action of national parliaments. Its powers would be based on signed treaties. The headquarters of the Arab Parliament was based in Damascus. However, given the terrible situation in Syria, the Parliament had been forced to suspend its work in Syria and to pursue activities in Cairo.

The issue of parliamentary diplomacy was close to his heart as he was a jurist. He believed that parliamentary diplomacy was based on the existence of a strong parliament; one that enjoyed all its prerogatives. Unfortunately, in the Arab world, democracy was far from perfect. While parliaments and electoral systems existed, the tools needed to put democracy into practice did not. That was true of all Arab countries, with the exception of the Arab Spring countries. It was hoped that those countries – Libya, Tunisia and Egypt – would be able to achieve true democracy.

The Arab Parliament had sent delegations to South Sudan and Khartoum to try and find a solution to the conflict there. Unfortunately, it had not been successful. A number of attempts had also been made to find a solution to the crisis in Syria, but thus far all efforts had failed. For that reason, on a daily basis crimes and murders were being perpetrated against civilians, in particular children. The Arab world had its fair share of problems. For example, Morocco and Algeria had closed their borders recently and it was through the Arab Parliament that efforts were being made to improve relations between the two countries and at least force the governments to respect "red lines". He felt that parliamentary diplomacy was the diplomacy of the future, especially since the world was a global village, and parliamentary groups were able to communicate with each other, not only through conferences and meetings, but also by using new information and communication technologies (ICTs). Those technologies would help take parliamentary diplomacy to new horizons. He expressed the hope that the IPU would make use of ICTs to convey ideas and decisions so as to influence opinion in the Arab world. Governments were currently fearful of public opinion, which was very important. These days, it was easy for opinion to be shaped in a few minutes or hours on any given question. He considered that it was important to organize a workshop or meeting on the means to develop parliamentary diplomacy and parliamentary work on a global basis and on new technologies.

Ms. S. GALLANT (Canada), speaking on behalf of NATO Parliamentary Assembly, indicated that the NATO Parliamentary Assembly was multilateral by design. The international NATO Convention would be held the following month. NATO was going through a transformation and was implementing "smart defence". The projects and studies that were currently being conducted included: consolidating the revolutions in North Africa, the forces of change and continuity in Russia, the movement of people across the Mediterranean, Afghanistan towards 2014 and beyond, the challenges of piracy, sources and implications of the euro crises, the Arab Spring and its economic dimensions and challenges for other countries, nuclear energy, and unmanned aerial vehicles.

A caveat must be imposed on the constraints arising from the limitations that governments put on their forces. For example, in Afghanistan, every soldier deployed had his/her risk increased by the restrictions imposed by member countries that did not allow their soldiers to participate to the extent of others. That shifted the burden to other countries, and consequently increased the number of casualties. More casualties meant that people back home, the people they served, lost some of their resolve. The entire mission could be jeopardized in such cases.

Through parliamentary diplomacy, at various NATO Parliamentary Assembly meetings, members were able to talk one on one about the impact they were having on the mission and on their success as an allied force. NATO was a fertile breeding ground for future leaders and ministers of defence and security; it also provided them with contacts they might need in the future when there was a potential crisis point. For example, many parliamentarians had travelled to Ukraine to implore the release of former president Yulia Tymoshenko, protest against her incarceration, learn about her medical condition, and bring her medical attention.

In studying the countries that were aspiring to become NATO Members, individual contacts between parliamentarians had proven crucial. When a conflict arose, often the first item targeted was communications. Relations between parliamentarians often enabled information on what was happening on the ground to get out when communications were cut.

Regarding the conflict in Afghanistan, at the IPU Assembly, Canadian parliamentarians were able to talk to women Afghan parliamentarians about that conflict and obtain first-hand information about how the Canadian presence in the country was affecting the Afghan people.

A forum on energy had also been held during the IPU Assembly. A group of African women was trying to find ways of getting less expensive energy for their citizens. It just happened that there was a philanthropist in my constituency who was providing non-governmental micro-credits. The project was called "Lighting Africa". He would provide a single solar lantern to a mother so that she could replace her kerosene lamp. With the money she saved, she could buy more food, have light longer at night so she could read to educate herself and her children, and with the money saved she could pay back the cost of that lantern and buy another lantern for another woman who was off the electrical grid.

Mr. D. DRAMANI (Inter-Parliamentary Committee of the West African Economic and Monetary Union – WAEMU) explained that the WAEMU was made up of eight countries. The Committee had been created by a treaty signed by these countries. The Committee was not yet a plenary committee; it had yet to be ratified by one member country, possibly by the end of the year.

Currently, WAEMU parliamentarians were appointed by the national parliaments, with each parliament appointing five members. The Inter-Parliamentary Committee nonetheless participated in committee, debates and reports on topics covered by the treaty.

WAEMU considered matters such as immigration, the free movement of people and goods and the resolution of inter-State conflicts. To that end, it had established an Inter-Parliamentary Council for Peace. The mandate of that body was to endeavour to prevent conflict and, when conflict did arise, to facilitate a peaceful resolution. The Council had been extremely successful, especially in Côte d'Ivoire. The Inter-Parliamentary Council for Peace regularly sent missions to observe elections in member countries. Its observation mission reports and recommendations were distributed to all WAEMU member countries. He concurred that parliamentary diplomacy should be codified and structured.

Ms. A. AL-MUBARAK (Bahrain) also concurred with the speaker from the Arab Parliament that guidelines should be developed to further clarify parliamentary diplomacy. As a woman parliamentarian, she believed that the IPU should look into sending ambassadors to conflict areas. Such ambassadors could also have parliamentary diplomacy functions. They could meet with the parliamentarians in conflict areas to obtain first-hand knowledge of events. She also believed that parliaments should invest in new media to improve communications between parliamentarians and the public on the one hand and between the IPU and its Members on the other. The IPU should be more active and inform its Members of developments regarding the situations in other countries.

There should be specialization among parliamentarians. For instance, parliamentarians who were physicians could go to Haiti to investigate disease propagation. The IPU needed to be modernized and embrace change as international events had changed the world and the Organization.

Mr. H. JENKINS (Australia) indicated that multilateral, regional and bilateral agreements existed side by side. The danger was that, with such a proliferation of agreements made at different levels, the instruments might actually contradict each other.

Australia was a member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum, and observers at the ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly and the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. It thus played different roles within the different bodies.

It was a well-known fact that bilateral agreements were strong and powerful instruments often negotiated through parliamentary diplomacy. He had personally learned more about some issues meeting directly with parliamentarians than at any other forum. The messages conveyed in bilateral relations were often different from those sent in a multilateral setting.

One of the IPU's great advantages was its diverse membership. Being a gathering of parliamentarians, it brought together members of ruling, opposition and other parties. The importance of that diversity lay in the fact that that, although governments changed, through the participation of parliaments in parliamentary diplomacy, some measure of continuity could be guaranteed. He commended the IPU for its commitment to ensure that opportunities for parliamentary democracy in many of the hot spots in the world had been opened, and in many places achieved. He advised that, from time to time, they must step back from the multilateral organizations they belonged to.

Mr. A.N. ATANASOF (Argentina) indicated that the chosen subject of today's meeting was very important and topical. Parliament was the soul of any democratic State because of its multiparty nature and the fact that it reflected the diversity of the various components of society.

The traditional functions of parliamentarians had changed and now included parliamentary diplomacy. Their discussion would enable them to analyse and debate a challenge that lay ahead. They wanted parliamentary diplomacy to be of service to governments.

There was no doubt that, with certain issues, parliamentarians made a significant contribution and a real difference. For example, they could press for national legislation to be adapted to international standards so as to help shape the position of countries on international matters. Parliamentary diplomacy fostered integration. It was a preventive kind of diplomacy and could help the executive to resolve issues even before conflict broke out.

He suggested that they concentrate on two aspects of parliamentary diplomacy in the future: the scope and limitations of parliamentary diplomacy so as to avoid encroaching on other powers, in particular the executive. He asked the IPU to organize an event to debate that and other questions in greater detail.

Mr. L. MOYO (Southern African Development Community Parliamentary Forum – SADC PF) explained that the SADC Parliamentary Forum was composed of 14 national parliaments with non-legislative powers. It had been established through a treaty in 1997.

It was presently advocating for becoming a permanent regional parliament with a full legislative mandate. The members of the Forum were elected through the national parliaments. The SADC PF fully embraced and supported the principle of parliamentary diplomacy as a way of engaging with Member States within the region.

There were hampered in their efforts, however, by some limitations: the need to respect the sovereignty of Member States and the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of Member States. The SADC PF was proud of its achievements and successes: election observation missions in Member States, the development of model laws that had been subsequently adopted by many Members, such as the law on HIV/AIDS, and the development of norms and standards on democratic elections as well as gender principles.

Activities were also undertaken at the political level. For example, in 2009 a delegation of Speakers of national parliaments had been sent to Zimbabwe to discuss a number of issues and engage with the Zimbabwe Government. It had managed to secure the right to observe the election process as well as other pressing issues. The SADC PF wished to play an even more positive and active role in influencing their governments in order to make them comply with democratic principles.

Mr. O. MARCUTIANU (Romania) said that the effectiveness of parliamentary diplomacy depended on a number of factors, one of the most important being diversity. Bilateral parliamentary dialogue often echoed the concepts of multilateral cooperation. The diversity of knowledge, experience and good practices of parliamentary diplomacy must be shared and developed within the national parliaments. That was one way to enhance the participation of parliaments in international cooperation, to the benefit of the organizations to which they belonged.

Mechanisms to promote the exchange of information and consultation on common issues must be implemented among the parliamentary diplomacy stakeholders. Ensuring the efficiency of parliamentary diplomacy posed a real challenge. Coherence and consensus-building must be facilitated among the various organizations, assemblies and bodies dealing with similar issues. The IPU had been able to establish intelligent partnerships with other specialized parliamentary assemblies and networks. It could play an even greater role in promoting peace and security, especially in terms of preventing conflicts and peace-building activities.

Mr. G. PENADÉS (Uruguay) endorsed the proposal made by the speaker from Argentina that the question should be debated and examined thoroughly through several meetings. Parliamentary diplomacy was a necessity today and a very good thing for States. What kind of parliamentary diplomacy were they talking about? What kind of organizations would be able to move forward in that task, both multilaterally and bilaterally?

They had heard from many organizations today that dealt with regional issues. Many of those organizations did not have parliamentary diplomacy as a core objective. That forced them to work on those situations. They must try to move forward, because citizens were demanding results. For many of their citizens, such meetings were seen as excuses to travel. Parliamentarians would have to work hard to convince them, and prove to them, that parliamentary diplomacy was a reality, that it was essential and would benefit citizens.

It was necessary to establish rules and regulations to define what was meant by parliamentary diplomacy and the objectives sought. Parliamentary diplomacy could be conducted by representative of parliaments that were democratically elected or not, but did it have the same impact in both instances?

The IPU needed to identify different levels of organizations. In his region there were five organizations. All were regional and some encompassed the entire hemisphere. Were they complementary or was there some overlap. Duplication of efforts might actually undermine parliamentary diplomacy. He believed that the topic needed to be developed. They needed to work on a process to move forward and to enhance their respectability and visibility in that area and should focus on tangible results.

Mr. J.R. TAU (South Africa) noted that parliaments exercised limited oversight of implementation of agreements concluded through multilateral parliamentary diplomacy. In some instances, even if there was an agreement, once it came before parliament, the opposition might choose to pull in the opposite direction and undermine the objectives of the agreement.

How could they build on best practices to enhance parliamentary diplomacy? How could they learn from what other parliaments were doing? Sharing best practices and expertise could contribute to strengthening parliamentary diplomacy.

How should parliaments deal with the influence of a particular agenda? For example, NGOs that attempted to sway parliamentarians from the ruling or opposition party with a specific agenda they wished to see prevail in the country.

Mr. R.S. PRASAD (India) informed the delegates that it was his first time at the IPU. He was observing multilateralism in full play. Many problems facing the world in the past decade had underscored the need for parliamentarians to take appropriate action on several issues, such as the environment, climate change, extremism and gender rights.

Diplomatic initiatives by parliamentarians should not be treated exactly the same as those taken under the umbrella of State diplomacy. While both had their limitations, trust, respect and reciprocity were needed in particular when conducting parliamentary diplomacy.

He shared some experiences in the Indian context. Parliamentary friendship groups were being promoted and were leading to a new understanding on a whole range of issues.

Globalization had serious consequences – negative and positive – on society. Parliamentarians should reflect on the challenges facing them. With regard to parliamentary diplomacy, they would have to think outside the box, identify problems and play a complementary role alongside the executive in resolving the crisis.

Mr. R.M. AL SHURAIQI (United Arab Emirates) considered that it was quite obvious that parliamentary diplomacy played a heightened role in international relations. That was the main reason for the need to represent people and build the relationship between States and institutions. Its goal was to meet international needs, which could be achieved through multilateralism. The UAE felt first of all that all parliaments should develop parliamentary practices through multilateralism and external representation. All political persuasions should be brought on board in a bid to be as inclusive as possible. Parliaments should be able to guarantee the interests of their citizens. Second, the guarantee of multilateralism at the international level involved greater representation, which should be reflected through a number of decisions aimed at protecting the interests of different groups or movements in society. Third, he believed that the IPU should play a pivotal role in strengthening multilateralism among the various delegations, particularly regarding women's representation on delegations to IPU Assemblies. Fourth, parliamentary diplomacy represented the essence of diplomacy, which was why he had suggested that a technical group composed of parliamentary experts be set up. That group would study the relationship between multilateralism and parliamentary diplomacy, and the IPU would take on board the results of that study. He asked for that point to be reflected in the final resolution. Fifth, it was important to talk about parliamentary diplomacy and its relationship with multilateralism because if official diplomacy stemmed from the supremacy of national security, then parliamentary diplomacy stemmed from national interests in a context that reflected the interests of the people. Given the importance of the topic, he suggested that their report should take into account the relationship between multilateralism and parliamentary diplomacy.

Mr. I. ABUFAED (Libya) thanked the international community on behalf of his country and people for its support during the revolution. In fewer than eight months Libyans had surprised the world when they elected the first genuine Libyan Parliament in credible elections. Over the past 42 years Libyans had suffered under the leadership of a tyrant, which was why they sympathized with Syrians, who were currently suffering the same fate. Unfortunately, there was not the same support for the Syrian revolution. The conflict was already in its second year and no measures had been taken to impose a no-fly zone over Syria in order to prevent the daily bombardments. He appealed to the international community and parliamentarians and politicians from across the world to take a firm stance on the humanitarian situation in Syria in order to stop the bloodshed.

Mr. F. BUSTAMANTE (Ecuador) concurred with the delegate of Uruguay on the difficulty of convincing the public that parliamentary diplomacy was truly valuable and not merely an excuse to travel. The majority of countries concluded international treaties – bilateral or multilateral – which had to be ratified by parliamentarians. Sometimes ratification was not simple, for example regarding the treaty creating the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) some years previously. The process had required two thirds of the countries to ratify the convention. The experience of Ecuador, which had held the presidency of UNASUR, had been very interesting. The country had discovered, partly by chance, that it was easier for parliamentarians to convince their peers from other parliaments of how important that treaty was and thus of the need to ratify it. So many delegations, led by the Speaker of the National Assembly of Ecuador, had travelled to the various countries and through a number of bilateral meetings, in roughly a year they had managed to convince their colleagues to support the ratification and entry into force of the new regional bloc. UNASUR was currently very active and reflected a long-held desire of South American countries to have their own association. A second example of the value of parliamentary diplomacy concerned the resolution of multilateral and bilateral conflicts. A number of years previously, Ecuador had been party to a conflict which had caused a temporary suspension of its relationships with Colombia. The Ecuadorians had realized that one way of easing the tensions and dealing with a delicate issue was to create bilateral, mutual acceptance before initiating full diplomatic relations. Parliamentarians of both countries had thus engaged in inter-parliamentary contacts and many Ecuadorian MPs had gone to Colombia to talk with NGOs and the media in order to put forward their perspective and try to calm the situation. He felt that parliamentarians, whose job was to reflect society, had to work with people, unions and regions. Therefore, a network of MPs with similar mandates could be established in a multilateral or bilateral context, which was normally the responsibility of traditional diplomacy. When cross-border issues arose, countries discovered that they had a lot of things in common with others. Such issues included gender equality, sexual orientation and the environment, among others. Those were issues that mattered not just to one electorate but also to those of other countries too. In order to convince the public about the value of parliamentary diplomacy, they needed to sell it as a concept. What they needed was a sound communications policy.

The MODERATOR thanked all the participants for their comments and presentations.

The CHAIR thanked the delegates for the wealth of information shared that day. He admitted that he had learned many things about organizations he was unfamiliar with, including the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. The concept of parliamentary diplomacy needed to be further explored. The topic today was multilateralism, but they could have had the same discussion about bilateralism.

Parliamentary diplomacy began with national parliaments. A number of issues must be streamlined: peace, development, the environment, women's rights and children's rights. All of those issues must be factored into parliamentary diplomacy. Another important point raised had been the different types of intervention. In addition to crisis resolution, there were also fundamental issues which, if resolved, would lead to an end of the crisis.

He observed that several speakers had talked about the limitations of parliamentary diplomacy. Parliamentarians should not delude themselves into thinking that they would be able to solve the world's diplomatic problems. They did not have the resources to do so and it was not their job. The goal of parliamentary diplomacy was to strengthen and complement State diplomacy. It was a diplomacy of support.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs**Sitting of Wednesday 24 October**

(Morning)

Session II: Special Session on observing United Nations Day (24 October)**Does the United Nations take democracy seriously enough?**

The meeting was called to order at 9.25 a.m. with Mr. J. Fitzgibbons (Australia) in the Chair.

The CHAIR welcomed the delegates and introduced the panellists: Ms. Elizabeth Spehar, Director of the Europe Division, United Nations Department of Political Affairs; Mr. Simon Dieuseul Desras, President of the Senate of Haiti; and Mr. David Dias Ximenes, a member of the Parliament of Timor-Leste.

Ms. E. SPEHAR, Panellist, indicated that she was also the chairperson of an informal working group called the Democracy Working Group of the Executive Committee on Peace and Security. That group tried to ensure greater coherence and a more robust approach to democracy within the United Nations. Political issues and challenges were addressed through the lens of international peace and security and were reflected in the structures of the organization. The United Nations did not have a democracy charter per se as did many regional organizations. However, democracy was clearly invoked in the UN Charter. The 2009 Guidance Note on Democracy developed for the UN Secretary-General clearly stated that those democratic principles were woven throughout the fabric of the United Nations. That principle had been clearly reaffirmed by Member States on a number of occasions, notably at the 2005 World Summit, where all Member States had reaffirmed: "democracy is a universal value based on the freely expressed will of people to determine their own political, economic, social, and cultural systems and their full participation in all aspects of their lives." Another example was the Millennium Declaration adopted by the UN General Assembly, which stated: "we will spare no effort to promote democracy and to strengthen the rule of law, as well as respect for all internationally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the right to development."

One of the concrete outcomes of that Declaration had been the MDGs, which had gained tremendous momentum through the years. UN work on democracy should be examined from two perspectives: the role of Member States and the role of the support system. It was fair to say that the UN General Assembly and the Security Council did not systematically tend to consider the issue of democracy as a broad goal or concept. Concretely, the United Nations was working with parliaments on the implementation of the full range of human rights and women's empowerment and had set up the working group on democracy. Despite the clear collective message of UN Member States, it was perceived that the notion of democracy was a western or northern concept. It was regarded with suspicion as being imposed by some on others. Using the "d" word posed a constant challenge. The word was being perceived in some contexts as inconvenient, to be avoided at all costs and replaced by good governance or inclusive politics. Another challenge was that there was no single, formal nucleus or centre of gravity for the issue of democracy at the United Nations. There was a Group of Friends of Mediation but the United Nations did not have a democracy group per se. The United Nations carried out a flurry of activities, which resulted in a certain dispersion of efforts. Various opportunities existed to further enhance the role of the United Nations in support of democracy. The UN Secretary-General had made supporting countries in transition a key priority, which was clearly linked to the issue of advancing democracy. He had been calling on leaders to listen to their people. A number of efforts were currently underway to shape or re-shape global policy. Many of those efforts needed to be merged or converge in the near future.

Mr. S.D. DESRAS, Panellist, said that the United Nations had officially come into being on 24 October 1945, after its Charter had been ratified by Member States. It championed democracy and human rights in its defence of the rights and freedoms of all of the world's peoples. Its mission was essentially to promote democracy and the rule of law and to defend human dignity and human rights. He asked to what extent that mission had been accomplished. Many believed that the United Nations, since its inception, had been a vital instrument in the advancement of human rights and basic

freedoms. It had developed diverse international concepts such as environmental protection, the law of the sea, gender equality and children's rights, among many others. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights constituted the principal international legal instruments that encapsulated the philosophy of the United Nations and governed its activities.

Speaking on behalf of the Haitian Parliament, he complimented the humanitarian, salutary and regulatory work performed by the United Nations worldwide. Despite the impressive list of actions undertaken by the United Nations, however, Haiti had some very formal reservations regarding the effectiveness of the UN peacekeeping or stabilization missions in Haiti over the past two decades. Diplomatic relations between Haiti and the United Nations were mutually appreciated. However, since the 1991 coup d'état, relations between Haiti and the United Nations had deteriorated. The return to constitutional order in 1994 had been carried out under the direction of the United States and the United Nations. Food riots, sky-high unemployment figures and huge price hikes had ensued. The UN missions had contributed to the impoverishment of the country. The Haitian population often wondered about the passive and even useless presence of those missions during periods of great uncertainty. What had those missions to Haiti achieved other than strengthening the country's economic and political dependence on the world's major powers? What kind of democracy could the United Nations lay claim to in reference to Haiti? The UN Security Council had recently extended the mandate of the UN Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH). To what end? That mission no longer had any credibility in Haiti. Democracy in Haiti required the establishment of a State that was responsible, served the nation and organized and regulated public life. The United Nations had only worked to establish a kind of "ready-made" democracy that was incompatible with the kind of democracy that had been developed by the Haitian people on the basis of their history, culture, aspirations and values.

Mr. D. DIAS XIMENES (Timor-Leste), Panellist, said that Timor-Leste was celebrating 10 years of independence and was enjoying stability and security, better living conditions, and one of the highest economic growth rates in the world. Yet the path to peace had not been an easy one. The country's relations and cooperation with the United Nations had helped to secure peace and promote development. It was important for Timor-Leste to recognize its fragility and leave behind its traumatic past of conflict. It had also had to address the root causes of its problems in order to achieve permanent and sometimes difficult solutions. By fostering collective accountability and building cooperation and tolerance, Timor-Leste had worked hard and managed to resolve critical issues by 2008. It had embarked on critical reforms in the security sector and established new institutions, including an independent Civil Service Commission and an Anti-Corruption Commission and had strengthened the judiciary in a bid to promote good governance and the rule of law. The country's initiatives benefited from strong local ownership and the support of its development partners. Part of its success was due to its long-term partnership with the United Nations and the international community. At the end of 2012, the mandate of the UN peacekeeping mission and International Stabilization Forces would come to an end. 2012, therefore, marked a new chapter in Timor-Leste's history: a chapter of ongoing institutional strengthening with a view to boosting national development. Its accomplishments had instilled in the hearts of the Timorese people a very special feeling of accomplishment and national pride. The country was now looking to the future and seeking to establish a new framework of cooperation with the United Nations and its development partners.

The presence of the United Nations had been important in the country's short existence as a State. Above all, it had helped it learn from the mistakes of the past. The Timorese had come to understand that peace and stability were essential prerequisites for State-building. Democracy was an ongoing process; it was unfinished business that was always open to change and improvement. The work of the United Nations in the State-building process consisted mainly of providing support to strengthen the State in different areas. It was important to first establish the degree of involvement of the international community in that process. Democracy must always be an internal process with strong ownership from the country's authorities in order to provide a lasting solution. It was the best known model of governance. The duty of the United Nations towards humanity made the organization a foremost agent of change. Its efforts to preserve peace, security and human dignity must move from the altruistic plan to a more interventionist one, which essentially meant replacing a reactive agenda with a proactive one. In order to have democracy clearly present in a larger number of UN resolutions and documents, it was important to assume that democracy was indeed a common objective to all relevant partners.

Debate

The delegate of SAUDI ARABIA believed that the United Nations was not taking democracy seriously enough. The organization retained a Cold War mentality whereby the vanquishers of the Second World War were predominant. The IPU needed to enhance its cooperation with the United Nations and strengthen the work of its standing committees. Greater efforts must be made to narrow the gap between the political decisions taken at the United Nations and the role of parliamentarians around the world. Many parliamentarians did not address international issues but focused only on political and economic issues at the national level.

The delegate of INDIA observed that legitimacy, public consent, responsiveness of the people and consideration for citizens' needs were very important elements in the functioning of any institution based on democratic principles. Democratic governance sought the advancement of economic development and security. The United Nations had been very active in providing assistance and taking initiatives to promote democracy around the world. Democracy was a universal core value. The United Nations had been able to promote the principles of democracy and good governance. However, he noted that among the many items on the UN agenda throughout the year, none were aimed specifically at democracy. The key link between peace, security, economic development and democracy had been ignored. The world was changing. India had been taking steps to address major challenges. Collective action and a multilateral approach were an important part of resolving international issues. The United Nations must undertake reforms that would make it truly representative and enhance its credibility and effectiveness, starting with the composition of the Security Council. There was a mismatch between the agenda set by the UN General Assembly and what was done in the Security Council. It was high time for the Security Council to take action based on consensus rather than give way to the overriding power of veto.

The representative from PAKISTAN considered that the structure of the UN Security Council, with permanent members having veto power, negated the very principle and concept of democracy. The United Nations should not be based on power politics but rather on justice. The world had seen many dictators accommodated by the UN system. The UN Secretary Council needed to be reviewed and reformed and any expansion must be based on democratic norms.

The representative from PORTUGAL commended Timor-Leste on its flourishing democracy and neighbouring democracies on their display of international solidarity. It was important to know how to cooperate in order to meet the aspirations of different peoples. He saluted the Syrian people for their democratic aspirations.

The delegate of KENYA said that it was important to understand the real politics of the United Nations in the world today. The United Nations did not promote democracy in the world; it was run by the Security Council and the rest of UN Member States were mere cheerleaders. The developed countries obliged other countries to espouse democracy and wanted the legislatures of the poorer countries to pass and impose laws. Democracy must always be the choice of the people and the United Nations was by no means a model of democracy. It waited for situations to get out of control before taking any action. It was imperative that the United Nations be reformed. For the past 50 years it had been a masquerade manipulated by the superpowers.

Ms. E. SPEHAR, Panellist, noted that Security Council reform was an overarching concern among Member States. There had been attempts at reform over the years and efforts were being pursued to bring about change. The question was how to reform to everyone's satisfaction.

Mr. D. DIAS XIMENES, Panellist, considered that international solidarity was at the heart of Timor-Leste's success. Nations must be aware of their rights and duties and build partnerships with the United Nations.

The rule of law

Mr. A.B. JOHANSSON, Secretary General of the IPU, talked about the importance of parliamentary work in relation to the rule of law. The IPU had supported the publication of a guide for politicians on the rule of law and had been working with a UN process, which had led to a High-level Meeting and Declaration on the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels adopted by the 67th session of the General Assembly at its opening session. The IPU had organized a parliamentary panel during that week, which had brought together a large number of parliamentarians, who had welcomed that development. The Declaration included a definition of the rule of law and its full scope and stressed the importance of an independent judiciary. It reaffirmed the principle of gender equality, the rights of the child and the importance of combating corruption. Nevertheless, it did have its shortcomings: weak language on impunity and failure to identify the key features of justice mechanisms. Paragraph 34 of the Declaration recognized the essential role of parliaments in the rule of law at the national level and welcomed the interaction between the United Nations, national parliaments and the IPU. It also suggested that the IPU should establish further benchmarks as well as provide technical assistance to parliaments.

A video message by Mr. Hans CORELL (Sweden) was screened. Mr. Corell had served as Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs and the Legal Counsel of the United Nations from March 1994 to March 2004. He talked about a new publication entitled *The Rule of Law – A Guide for Politicians*, published by the Raoul Wallenberg Institute for Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (Sweden) and the Hague Institute for the Internationalization of Law (HiIL).

Ms. E. SPEHAR, Panellist, explained that the United Nations welcomed the focus on the rule of law. The high-level event mentioned by the IPU Secretary General had been unique insofar as it had been the first time that Heads of State had gathered to discuss the rule of law. The discussion on the rule of law was similar to the broader democracy agenda in terms of dispersion of efforts. That renewed focus would help achieve greater coherence and effectiveness on the ground. There were 17 different areas within the United Nations that worked on the rule of law, which had received a mandate to merge under one umbrella. The Declaration was central to the three main pillars of the United Nations and called for the relationship between the rule of law and development to be considered in the development agenda.

The CHAIR thanked the panellists for their presentations.

Election integrity

The CHAIR said that the IPU Declaration on Criteria for Free and Fair Elections, adopted in 1994, had been one of the first efforts aimed at identifying normative principles in international law for free and fair elections. Many others had since built on those criteria, often on a regional basis. More recently, in 2011, the IPU had adopted a resolution on Providing a sound legislative framework aimed at preventing electoral violence, improving election monitoring and ensuring the smooth transition of power, which made a series of recommendations for parliamentary action. Meanwhile, the United Nations had provided support to elections in more than 100 countries to date, drawing attention to the challenge of addressing the political and the technical aspects of polls. A new report produced by the Global Commission on Elections, Democracy and Security called for national and international action to protect and promote the integrity of elections, as a major step towards achieving a more secure, prosperous and stable world.

Mr. V. HELGESEN, Secretary General of the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA), said that International IDEA was an intergovernmental organization dedicated to supporting democratic processes around the world, with 27 Member States spanning the different continents. The motivation to establish the Global Commission on Elections, Democracy and Security had been the persistent and continuing challenge of flawed and violent elections. The Commission used as a starting point the fact that, since 2000, all but 11 countries – not all of which were democratic – had held national elections. Elections could further or undermine democracy,

development, human rights and security. In the Commission's view, what made the difference was the integrity of elections. Elections with integrity were defined as being professional, impartial and transparent throughout the entire electoral cycle and based on universal suffrage and political equality.

Why did elections with integrity matter? Because they could yield other tangible benefits for citizens: women's empowerment, less corruption and better service delivery to the poor, among many others. They could act as a catalyst. A study of 800 elections in 97 countries since 1975 had showed that elections with integrity were more likely to result in defeat for governments that did not deliver on economic development and civil liberties. It had been found that enhancing electoral accountability significantly decreased corruption among politicians. Moreover, increasing women's participation in government yielded concrete governance benefits on issues that mattered to families. In countries emerging from civil wars, research had found that when a peace agreement was accompanied by elections in which former combatants ran for office and campaigned for votes, countries were less likely to return to civil war.

It had also been shown that electoral integrity was essential for deepening democracy, but was not a given. The Commission identified five major challenges: elections took place in a political context and were thus vulnerable to political abuse, hence the importance of the rule of law; the need to set up professional independent electoral bodies; considering elections as a mutual security system where the winners were still limited in the exercise of their power and the losers were free to continue their political activities; barriers to participation must be removed so that the diversity of the population was reflected in positions in power; and obscure or poorly regulated political finance. Those were the greatest threats to the integrity of elections, in addition to bribery and organized crime, which undermined citizens' trust.

Based on those analyses, the Commission had put forward a number of recommendations: the need for the international community to engage earlier in the electoral processes; the need for regional organizations to set up and indicate clearly their "red lines" for electoral integrity; promote heavy investment in building the capacity of domestic, regional and international observer missions; establish an international safety net for electoral management bodies; and give political freedom greater priority as a building block of development. He proposed that the post-2015 framework should contain specific programmes and goals for delivering elections with integrity. In that context, the role of parliamentarians was crucial. Integrity, like democracy, needed to grow from within. There was an urgent need to democratize global aid frameworks and involve parliaments.

Debate

The delegate of LIBYA said that freedom, democracy and human rights were not internal issues of the countries in the world. The world had seen dramatic changes in the past 20 years which had had a direct impact on security and stability. Many tensions and acts of aggressions were caused because of differences between rulers, not between peoples. People around the world sought peace, security and communication and strove to build bridges of friendship and cooperation. Respecting the will of the people to enjoy democracy and human rights was a moral duty. In order to avoid religious or ideological extremism and terrorism, countries needed to move quickly to support human values across the globe and fight for justice and against persecution of all forms. In Libya, the end of dictatorship had come about through unified efforts. Citizens clearly demanded human rights, democracy and unity now that the dictator was gone. However, in Syria, a vicious war was being waged against civilians because they wanted democracy and freedom. He lamented the unfortunate role played by China and the Russian Federation in blocking international efforts to oust the Syrian regime and support a peaceful transition to democracy. It was high time to act responsibly and it was everyone's duty, starting with parliamentarians, governments and other public personalities, to bring pressure to bear. His hope was that the United Nations would refuse to admit as a member any non-democratic countries that did not comply with international standards.

The representative from UGANDA said that insinuations had been made about Kenya and Africa in general on the issue of democracy. It was important for the international community to start looking at the demands of African countries. It was impossible to speak about democracy in the world when global institutions did not allow certain key constituencies to play a role. African countries had been calling for reforms in the UN Security Council and in the United Nations generally so that they could participate in key decision-making.

The delegate of PAKISTAN considered that the rule of law was the basis of democracy and good governance. It should be observed and practised by governments and parliaments. He asked whether the rule of law did not apply to international relations, especially to the major powers. Attacking other countries in the name of pre-emptive self-defence was a clear display of disrespect for the rule of law.

The delegate of KENYA thanked the international community, and more precisely the former UN Secretary-General, for helping Kenya progress after the 2007 election. The country was still not out of the woods. Elections would be held in a few months and Kenya was counting on international support. While the situation had improved, a lot of work still remained to be done.

Mr. W. MADZIMURE (Zimbabwe) said that the UN Charter that had been developed many years ago explicitly mentioned democracy. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1948, implicitly acknowledged the principle of democracy by stating that the will of the people should be the basis of the authority of the government. It reminded them of the importance of universal suffrage and the right to elect or be elected. Each year approximately US\$ 1.5 billion was approved to support democratic processes. Was that amount adequate? Surely it was not for countries with young democracies. Democracy was an expensive enterprise. It was important to devise intervention and support mechanisms based on an accurate analysis of different democracies in their appropriate contexts. The IPU needed to spearhead democracy given its mandate and membership. It had created a common vision and understanding amongst the delegates in their respective parliaments. Nobody was above the law. There needed to be a separation of powers between the judiciary and the executive. Measures to support and strengthen those institutions must be put in place along with clear processes. There was public outcry for a level playing field, access to information and freedom from violence and intimidation.

Mr. V. HELGESEN, Secretary General of the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA), commented on the issue of global governance versus national governance: clearly the international community was anarchic and global governance was undemocratic and did not respect the rule of law. However, that did not mean that democratic progress could not happen. It is a sign of change that Libya was today a strong voice for democracy at the international level. Libya should be congratulated on its technically sound elections. Kenya had experienced very troubled elections. Much had happened since then in terms of building and reshaping institutions and frameworks but the call for the support of the international community must be heeded.

Declaration on Parliamentary Openness: Strengthening citizen understanding and participation in parliament

The CHAIR noted that in its 2006 landmark publication *Parliament and democracy in the twenty-first century: A guide to good practice*, the IPU included "openness" as one of the five core values of democratic parliaments (along with being representative, accessible, accountable and effective). He introduced the panellists: Mr. Andrew Mandelbaum, Senior Programme Officer, National Democratic Institute, USA; Ms. Melissa Ortiz Massó, Researcher, FUNDAR, Centre for Analysis and Research, Mexico; and Mr. Eric Mill, Web and mobile developer, Sunlight Foundation, USA.

Mr. E. MILL, Panellist, noted that the Declaration on Parliamentary Openness had been developed by a group parliamentary monitoring organizations (PMOs). Starting in 2006, the IPU, the United Nations and a number of other organizations had initiated a process to develop standards for democratic parliaments and self-assessment frameworks for parliaments. They had started by identifying key areas for reform and building consensus on norms. The question that arose was: how did civil society monitor and rate parliaments? Many innovative techniques to monitor parliaments had been created throughout the world. A study had found that not all PMOs benefited from best practices and some monitored parliaments in a more confrontational way. Parliamentary information was a vital challenge to PMOs, which had difficulty accessing what they considered to be necessary data. Thirty-eight PMOs from around the world had gathered to discuss parliamentary information and launch that Declaration. In essence, the Declaration made an appeal to parliaments to develop a more collaborative process with PMOs. Close to 95 organizations from 65 countries supported the Declaration, which had been launched at the e-Parliament Conference held a few weeks previously in Rome. The Declaration enjoyed the support of the United Nations and the IPU. The first section was based on the premise that parliamentary information belonged to citizens.

Ms. M. ORTIZ MASSÓ, Panellist, described the next two sections of the Declaration. They dealt with making parliamentary information transparent, how parliaments worked and how they provided information inter alia about parliamentarians' party affiliation and ties with their constituencies. The next section had to do with facilitating access to parliamentary information and to parliament as an institution.

Mr. E. MILL, Panellist, described the fourth section of the Declaration: the relationship with technology, specifically the Internet. Information belonged to citizens, which could mean many things. Because of technology, things that had previously not been possible were very much so now. Expectations and capabilities had changed. It should be a given that any citizen should be able to know what was happening in parliament. That section indicated that parliament was also a data provider. Information must be available, searchable and re-usable. A new concept was emerging that information must be provided in a raw form. Such data could be taken and be re-used.

Ms. M. ORTIZ MASSÓ, Panellist, said that she represented a civil society network representing 18 organizations that dealt with accountability and transparency in Latin American parliaments. Its aim was to raise standards in order to foster transparency and promote best practices. Eight countries were members of that network, which had been involved in parliamentary monitoring and developing an index to gauge the transparency of the region's parliaments. The network had supported the Declaration with a view to fostering openness. It was currently working on conflicts of interest. FUNDAR wanted to make sure that citizens had access to information, especially about the work of parliamentarians. It also worked with communications and the media in order to provide citizens with information.

Mr. E. MILL, Panellist, explained that the Sunlight Foundation focused on enhancing government transparency through technology. It had an extensive team of developers, a policy department and a team of journalists. All its work was conducted through the lens of technology and what technology could do for governance and transparency. The Foundation advocated for transparent policies and increased access to data. It built applications, websites, tools, analyses, and published data on government information. The Foundation endeavoured to make tools that were accessible and engaging, but also useful to activists and professionals alike.

The CHAIR invited contributions from the floor.

Ms. J. FRASER (Canada) expressed some concern regarding paragraph 24 of the Declaration on disclosure of parliamentarians' individual assets and income. While that was a right course of action it was a sensitive one. Parliamentarians had a right to privacy and would resist excessive invasion of their privacy. Disclosure should also involve gifts, including travel paid for by persons or bodies other than the parliament. She suggested that it was not necessary to disclose the amounts or value of assets but the source of income should suffice to determine whether or not a parliamentarian had a conflict of interest.

The delegate of NAMIBIA commented that parliaments and executives needed to encourage technology, including e-government, and introduce paperless technologies. Mechanisms should be devised for providing assistance to developing countries with e-voting and other technologies and with the transfer of technology and capacity building.

The CHAIR thanked the panellists and delegates for their remarks and declared the session closed.

Launch of handbook on Supporting Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament

Mr. S.H. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) assumed the Chair and announced the launch of a new handbook entitled Supporting Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament.

A video presentation was screened on disarmament and non-proliferation, which included interviews with parliamentarians from around the world.

The CHAIR commented on the video. In 2009, the IPU had adopted an important consensus resolution entitled: Advancing nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament and securing the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty: The role of parliamentarians. In 2011, the UN Secretary-General had followed up on his five-point proposal and written to parliaments. In his letter he highlighted the key role parliamentarians could play in advancing the cause of a nuclear-weapon-free world. The handbook illustrated important steps and provided practical tips. Many parliamentarians already had a full plate and apprehended the mere thought of taking up new causes. Yet there was no reason to shy away from that issue. They had a responsibility to protect the whole planet and must take action that made a difference.

Mr. T. TÓTH, Executive Secretary of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) Preparatory Commission, spoke about the historical background and the current context of the handbook, which essentially dealt with regulations. Parliamentarians were entrusted with the well-being of citizens in full knowledge that security was a public good. What measures were taken to look after public goods? A recent example was the 2011 disaster at the Fukushima Nuclear Plant in Japan. How could parliamentarians play the dual role of regulators and custodians? What was their track record as custodians of security? The global community had failed too many times to agree the right amount of cooperative regulations. Although some countries had signed regional arrangements on non-proliferation and disarmament, there were still many gaps on the map: the Middle-East and some parts of Asia. Against the backdrop of so many failures and a poor track record, certain lessons must be drawn. First of all, reconciliation was a sine qua non for those regions. It was not enough to take the actions described in the Handbook; the world needed a change of mind-set and a new modus operandi for international security.

Mr. R. RYDELL, Senior Adviser, UN Office for Disarmament Affairs, said that he would elaborate on the comparison between the legislative process and the process at the United Nations of handling disarmament issues. The legislative process began with a general objective. Reality soon intervened and compromises were made. Final enactment often did not reflect the original idea. The next step was funding and how the issue was perceived by the general public. The process was really not that different when compared with how the disarmament issue had developed at the United Nations. It had also started with a lofty concept. Along the way a number of compromises had been reached in order to achieve the goal. A convergence had emerged between national and global goals. UN Member States recognized the importance of developing national capacities, strong export controls, tight security controls in order to prevent terrorism and the need for nuclear States to develop their own laws and institutions to honour their own disarmament commitments to those global goals. In the past disarmament had been an abstract concept. Parliaments had been able to render it more concrete and to approach it as a political challenge. Parliaments had a crucial role to play in that issue by way of ratifying treaties, fostering debate and holding the executive to account. Future action must entail multi-party cooperation, competing priorities, the need for opinion leaders in parliament, networking among different parliaments, availability of staff resources and including parliamentarians in national delegations to UN meetings.

Ms. H. LAVERDIÈRE, Deputy Chair of Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament (PNND), said that while the world was facing several crises, the nuclear threat should not be overlooked. As parliamentarians, they did not always have the necessary tools to tackle such a complicated issue. Nevertheless, they must deal with that issue with urgency and determination. They could not act alone but must work with other parliamentarians, the government, international

organizations and civil society. Parliamentarians had a crucial role to play in the process and were an essential link in the chain. The Handbook met a need for information and tools. From the reduction of stockpiles to education, research and the negotiation of treaties, it gave concrete examples of best practices and was useful for everyone.

The CHAIR thanked the parliamentarians for their call to action.

Mr. R. VAN RIET, World Future Council, (co-author of the handbook) started by quoting Martin Luther-King: "Although law cannot change the heart, it can restrain the heartless". The vision for a world free of nuclear weapons had re-emerged and constituents from all around the world had expressed their support for achieving that goal. How could they implement that vision? Parliamentarians had a critical role to play. Following the IPU's adoption of a resolution on Advancing nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament and securing the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, the Handbook had been produced with the aim of assisting parliaments in implementing nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament goals. The publication highlighted a range of good practices and explored what type of action parliamentarians could take. It was divided into 12 chapters, each covering a key issue. It identified different types of States with different roles to play. The Handbook recognised that good practices existed in each category of States. The IPU would use that tool and many others to engage with its membership on that issue.

Debate

Mr. N. NIGMATULIN (Kazakhstan) thanked the IPU delegates who had participated in the anti-nuclear conference that had taken place in Astana, Kazakhstan, in August 2012. On 29 August 1991, the President of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, had issued a decree on closing the world's biggest nuclear test site, Semipalatinsk. When the country had been part of the Soviet Union, during four decades, more than 450 nuclear and hydrogen explosions had been carried out on the test-site, resulting in irreparable damage to human health and the environment. The power of the weapons tested on the Semipalatinsk site exceeded 2,500 times the power of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima in 1945. The people living in the region still suffered disastrous consequences of those explosions and the level of mortality and life-threatening diseases remained very high. The surrounding site was contaminated by radioactive debris and the ecological system was drained. Thousands of hectares of land were not usable. The closure of the site had triggered a mass movement for the prohibition of nuclear testing around the world. The site closing date, 29 August, was declared by the United Nations as the International Day against Nuclear Tests.

Kazakhstan had voluntarily renounced its powerful nuclear potential and in 2006, had signed the Semipalatinsk Treaty with neighbouring States to create a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. The country had introduced a number of new initiatives such as the adoption of the Universal Declaration on a Nuclear Weapon-Free World, signing the treaty on universal horizontal and vertical non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the opening in Kazakhstan of an international nuclear fuel bank under the authority of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). In order to provide a reliable source and guarantee the safe use of nuclear power for peaceful purposes, President Nazarbayev had introduced four underlying principles on which nuclear energy must be developed: universality, transparency, efficiency, and equality and trust. In August 2012, Kazakhstan had hosted the international conference "From a nuclear test ban to a nuclear-free world". Parliamentarians from over 70 countries had been present. President Nazarbayev had seized the opportunity to launch the international Internet project known as "ATOM" (Abolish Testing: Our Mission). That project was aimed at rallying the citizens of the world to put an end to the testing of nuclear weapons. He expressed the hope that the Kazakh example would free the world of nuclear weapons.

Ms. M.M. KAMAL SALIB (Egypt) highlighted the importance of the Handbook. She saluted Kazakhstan for its disarmament efforts and underscored the need to stop the nuclear race. Parliaments had an important role to play in preventing an arms race and she encouraged everybody to get involved.

Mr. M. MONESTEL CONTRERAS (Costa Rica) said that Costa Rica promoted peace and disarmament. South America was the first region in the world to be free of nuclear weapons. The nuclear threat must be eliminated. A consensus had been reached on demilitarization of all forms of weapons. Costa Rica had implemented its demilitarization programme since 1948, when it had emerged from a civil war with the resolve that such a breakdown in the civil order should never be repeated again. That had led to the suppression of the country's armed forces. Since then, Costa Rica had shown that diplomacy and the law offered much better protection than guns. Fourteen countries had followed Costa Rica's example. The country had participated in the 1996 International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons. Costa Rica continued to promote a nuclear-weapon-free world. He applauded the IPU for producing such a useful handbook and expressed the hope that a Spanish version would soon be available.

Mr. A. PONLABOOT (Thailand) congratulated all those involved in the production of the handbook. The use of nuclear weapons would have untold humanitarian consequences. It was important to ensure that nuclear weapons were never used again. The handbook would assist parliamentarians in working with their governments and parliamentary colleagues to achieve that goal. He urged parliamentarians to support efforts to make South Asia a nuclear free zone.

Ms. M. KUMAR (India) said that no process for the elimination of nuclear weapons could succeed unless it fulfilled the following criteria: it must be universal, non-discriminatory, time-bound, phased and verifiable. In reference to the Martin Luther-King quotation, efforts must be made to do away with the apartheid in the existing nuclear weapons order whereby countries covered by Article VI of the Treaty on Nuclear Non-Proliferation (NPT) followed different principles and different laws to those that governed other parties to the NPT.

The CHAIR thanked the delegates and panellists for their contributions.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs**Sitting of Thursday 25 October**

(Morning)

**Session III: Panel discussion on Rio+20 in perspective:
What hope for sustainable development?**

The meeting started at 9.20 a.m. with Mr. P. Mooney, Executive Director, ETC Group, acting as Moderator.

The MODERATOR introduced the panellists: Mr. Fernando Bustamante of Ecuador; Mr. Nikhil Seth, Director, Division for Sustainable Development, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN-DESA); Ms. Corinne Woods, Director, United Nations Millennium Campaign; and Mr. Olivier De Schutter, United Nations Special Rapporteur on the right to food.

Mr. F. BUSTAMANTE, Panellist, indicated that he wished to elaborate on Ecuador's position at the Rio+20 Summit. The 2008 Constitution contained three innovations regarding sustainable development and the environment. It had introduced collective rights in a bid to go beyond individual rights and individual persons and recognize rights in collective matters. It was a way of giving human rights to collective entities. This post-individualistic approach was debatable but Ecuador did not deny the rights of the individual. Second, the rights of the generations to come were introduced. The concept of inter-generational responsibility was very important when developing policies. The third innovation was the need to protect nature, which did not have a voice to defend itself. As an analogy, just because some people did not have a voice, it did not mean that they did not have rights. It was impossible to continue to sustain human life if humans did not understand that life was deeply rooted in the cosmos on which it depended and to which it contributed.

Ecuador had not been satisfied with the Rio+20 Outcome and had not been part of the consensus that had emerged. It had raised a number of concerns, namely: it had seen no sign of political will. There had been many discussions and many good intentions but they did not go to the heart of the matter. The crucial question remained unanswered: Why after so many years of discussions were the major players still unable to make decisions? There were powers behind the scene that controlled the agenda. It was imperative to find clear mechanisms and steps that were binding to all parties. In addition, it was imperative to consider the prevailing asymmetries. Countries fighting hunger had a different position to those who had greater access to resources. There was a need to impose a worldwide tax on resources. The world needed to recognize the rights of nature and rethink development models in sustainable terms. The shift must be made to the notion of development with a purpose. Currently, the market determined what was good for society. That model was in crisis and was unsustainable as a model for humanity. Countries must meet their people's needs and ensure a reasonable approach to life for everyone.

Mr. N. SETH, Panellist, said that Rio+20 had been the biggest conference ever convened by the United Nations. What had been achieved? What was next? What was the actual implementation on the ground? Upon evaluating the outcomes of Rio+20, it must be realized that there were many outcomes. The Outcome Document was the obvious one, but there were several others. There had been a rejuvenation of the concept of sustainable development. Once again, they had advanced the need for integrated decision-making. They had also been able to emphasize the need for coherence between institutions. Moreover, a strong focus had been placed on implementation, which was the only way to effect change. For the first time, the green economy had been placed on the agenda. It had led to controversial discussions and many of the developing economies were worried although it could be tailored to national circumstances. They had been able to reinforce sectorial and cross-sectorial issues for sustainable development such as water, energy, food security, oceans, cities, inequality and social equality. The ten-year framework for sustainable development had also been launched. New sustainable development goals would be identified as well as an implementation process. In addition, the Conference had achieved 750 voluntary commitments and established partnerships.

Rio+ 20 should not be seen as a closure; it had marked the start of a long-term process. What they did now was going to determine the value of Rio+ 20. What was the world going to achieve after Rio+ 20? There were many challenges. The long-term concerns were the interface between water, climate change, energy and food. Different countries were approaching those issues from different perspectives. It was important to set goals that were measurable. Countries must make a much stronger and persuasive case for the green economy, especially regarding its inclusive dimension and trade-offs. Science and technology must be placed at the service of the poor. The heart of change was at the national level.

Ms. C. WOODS, Panellist, said that a positive outcome of Rio+ 20 had been civil society's extraordinary appetite to seize the opportunity and start a process that would lead to an ambitious but realistic outcome. It remained for the United Nations, together with parliamentarians and other stakeholders, to seize that opportunity. There was an urgent need to ensure integration and bring people and the planet together while balancing the needs of both. One important lesson learned was that progress was possible with government leadership and ownership and when civil society and communities were involved. It was time for parliamentarians to look at what role they could play. The United Nations had put in place a process to start the consultation and discussion. Fifteen national consultations would be taking place in the next period. Every effort must be made to ensure that they were engaging for parliamentarians, civil society and citizens so that it was an agenda articulated by the people. Another possibility to reach citizens directly was through the use of technology. It was now time to hold parliamentary hearings on the post-2015 era.

Mr. O. DE SCHUTTER, Panellist, explained that his mandate consisted of proposing recommendations to governments on the realization of the right to food. He appealed to the delegates, noting that the indicators had swung into the red. Several boundaries had already been crossed and there was no more time to lose. Concrete measures needed to be taken. Parliamentarians had a responsibility to convince people that the transition needed to overcome challenges could be made through political means. The MDGs adopted in 2000 were not always fully understood. Ultimately, accountability was lacking as was insistence on civil society participation. The right to food constituted an ideal springboard for reflecting on sustainable development goals. The goals of participation and accountability were central components of current efforts to better guarantee the right to food. Some progress had been made. Governments had recognized that the right to food was essential to the achievement of food security objectives. In the 1999 report, Voluntary Guidelines to support the progressive realisation of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security, governments for the first time ever agreed on a definition of what constituted an economic and social right. That text had been unanimously adopted in 2004 by the members of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Council, and contained very specific recommendations. Today both processes were converging: the process that had followed the 1992 Rio Conference resulting in the MDGs and the process pertaining to the right to food and its progressive implementation.

The document adopted in Rio in June 2012, *The Future We Want*, made several references to the need to change production and consumption patterns in order to combat inequality. That document, was not the last word on the subject, but was rather a starting point. Parliaments had an essential role to play in the realization of the right to food. Significant progress had been made in some regions. The right to food was a strategic tool for enhancing the success of the fight for food security. They could thus ensure that the beneficiaries of that right would not be excluded. Institutions must be established to measure progress achieved and maintain pressure on governments. Civil society must be invested with a role in the identification of priorities. That would lead to more effective strategies. He appealed to the IPU to promote a strengthened role for national parliaments in the fight against hunger and malnutrition, and to put up a strong parliamentary front.

The delegate of INDIA said that in India, sustainable development was conceived in a holistic manner. It encompassed social progress, economic growth and environmental sustainability. The reality was that the history of colonial domination had consigned a vast number of people to extremely deprived conditions. The promotion of economic growth and development was the necessary precursor of poverty alleviation leading to poverty eradication. It was necessary to reconcile the requirements of development and the environment in order to render the process both sustainable and beneficial to the masses. The green economy was one but not the only means of achieving sustainable development.

He firmly rejected any attempt to put in place unilateral measures, punitive trade barriers and unwarranted conditionalities. India continued to engage constructively in developing and integrating the key elements of sustainable development.

The delegate of AUSTRALIA admitted that currently, Australians were worried about food security because other countries were buying up farmland in Australia. The country had become very isolated in the climate change debate for having introduced a carbon tax. He believed it was the right thing to do.

The representative from ARGENTINA applauded the optimism expressed by some of the panellists but feared that many concerns remained after Rio+ 20. The industrialized countries, which were the biggest polluters, seemed to be more concerned by the financial crisis. He felt that there was very little engagement on their part. In the parallel events held at Rio+ 20, a number of more progressive positions had been expressed. The agenda must be advanced; there was no time to waste. Above and beyond the efficient use of clean energy and clean production processes, reducing environmental damage and increasing business responsibility, they were really talking about the lives of citizens. He asked what action the United Nations expected to take to help parliamentarians play a role in the future.

The representative from INDONESIA said that the country had adopted six principles to help realize the post-2015 objectives of the development agenda. Although Indonesia had achieved 6.8% per cent economic growth, it had still not been able to eradicate poverty and achieve equity among regions. Democracy was still very new in Indonesia and people's expectations were very high. That might have an adverse effect on Indonesian democracy. In 2014, presidential elections would be held and people were already expressing concerns. Regional and global crises affected Indonesia and the development of democracy.

The delegate of FINLAND commented that poverty eradication would be a central sustainable goal. At Rio+ 20, Finland had supported the proposal that water and sanitation become new human rights. There was more talk about the MDGs than about sustainable development goals, which was why it was important to define concrete goals.

Mr. F.-X. de DONNEA (Belgium) said that, when examining the causes of the severe food shortages in some parts of the world, the focus should not be placed on the economic or political reasons of 50 or 60 years previously. He believed that countries in the North and in the South had made serious policy and economic and food strategy errors. The plundering – through illegal fishing or piracy – of certain food resources by northern countries had had serious consequences on the South. Some agricultural policies in the North had led to unfair competition with respect to imports. Major slip ups had been made in terms of emergency food aid and there was also the problem of financial speculation. Countries in the South also had their share of responsibility: diversion of resources by neighbouring countries, deforestation of border lands, poor regulation of markets and local speculation, among others. Collective errors had been made, often in good faith.

Mr. F. BUSTAMANTE, Panellist, said that often we tend to confuse the process with the results. We need to progress with an evaluation on the basis of measurable results. What we need to know is what we want to achieve and how we are going to measure it. First off, we need national legislation which will translate the objectives towards the achievement of the desirable effects. We need clear indicators. How are we going to measure development? The indicators based on growth, on accumulation no longer serve. We need quality indicators about life standards which express measures that have been adopted.

Mr. N. SETH, Panellist, replied that everyone and all countries must take ownership of the sustainable development agenda. It was hoped that sustainable development goals would develop in a sensible way and would form a matrix for measuring progress. The basic principles of a green economy were efficiency in production, responsibility in consumption, decarbonization, and inclusiveness. Parliamentary involvement should be based on the principles of Rio+ 20.

Ms. C. WOODS, Panellist, first answered the question on measurability and reporting: one of her greatest fears was a reductionist thinking that preferred to focus on the "simpler" MDGS, such as MDG2 than sustainability, which was more difficult to measure. However, the two could not be treated separately. In addition, the engagement of citizens in the North would be as important as that of citizens in the South. There was no time to waste; the opportunity to engage and set clear parameters must be seized now.

Mr. O. DE SCHUTTER, Panellist, responded to the comment made by the delegate of Australia concerning investment in farmland or "land grabbing". The problem was that countries had not been investing sufficiently in agriculture. They must invest in small-holders. Smaller farms were more efficient, better at managing the ecosystem, and contributed to rural development. They should be worried about current trends of investing in farmland. He also indicated that gender rights were key to the attainment of a sustainable economy and were greatly underestimated. He concurred with the delegate of Belgium that past problems had led to almost 900 million people going hungry today. However, precisely because mistakes had been committed in the past, it was important to enhance political accountability and make sure that policies implemented to improve food security were better informed and that parliaments were better equipped to maintain the pressure on governments to deliver results.

The MODERATOR thanked the panellists and the delegates for their contributions.

Session IV: UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Five Years On

The Moderator, Ms. A. RAMIREZ NAVA (Bolivia), introduced the first panellist, Grand Chief Edward John, Chair of United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, Canada.

Grand Chief E. JOHN, Panellist, started by acknowledging the ancestral lands of the Huron People. The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples had been adopted in September 2007 after two and half decades of intense struggles. Thanks to the efforts of the Global Indigenous Movement, an agreement had been reached and a document had been adopted that captured the range and diversity of indigenous peoples worldwide and placed their rights firmly on the international agenda. The adoption of that document was historical insofar as world leaders and indigenous people had come together and agreed to resolve their painful past and move forward. The UN Declaration guaranteed indigenous peoples the rights to self-determination, to their lands, territories and resources, to their cultural identities, to their own representation and to have their values and beliefs recognized and respected at the international level.

The UN Declaration was a living document. It set the minimum standards for the survival, dignity and well-being of the world's indigenous peoples. It also reflected the beginning of the healing and reconciliation process necessary for a new dawn in their respective and collective histories. Injustices had been recognized so as never to be repeated again. Indigenous peoples continued to call on the United Nations to address the ongoing systematic and systemic violation of the rights of indigenous peoples, including land rights. Lands and resources provided the basic foundation for all wealth. The Elders reminded them that if they took care of the land it would take care of them. Indigenous peoples' lands continued to be mined and logged. That has a negative and long-lasting impact on indigenous peoples. The UN Declaration provided for a fair and equitable resolution for indigenous peoples. With the adoption of the UN Declaration five years earlier, new and extensive responsibilities had been added to the mandate of the Permanent Forum. It was called upon to promote incorporation of the Declaration into national laws and policies. It was also called upon to follow up on the effectiveness of the UN Declaration: to examine and assess the realities on the ground to see how international standards were implemented at the local and national levels. A good example of how the Declaration had been able to translate rights into reality was the fact that the State of Bolivia had incorporated the Declaration into its laws and Constitution. They could not ignore the gaps in the implementation of the UN Declaration. As parliamentarians they also had responsibilities to indigenous peoples and should act on them. Together they could work towards a future based on recognition of equality.

Mr. T. HENARE (New Zealand) said that the treatment of indigenous peoples was at the heart of most of the problems in the world. The New Zealand Government was currently addressing issues concerning the sharing of resources, water and the selling of State assets. There had to be consultation with indigenous peoples in those matters. Power and vision must be shared in order to get to the next stage of sharing the spoils. The Prime Minister of New Zealand had said that the Declaration was aspirational; it was not a treaty. They should all aspire to the standards of the Declaration in all their policies. He wished to leave the delegates with one message: be open and upfront with the issues of indigenous peoples and share the resources.

The delegate of PALESTINE observed that the rights of the Palestinians had been continuously violated. Britain had brought Jews from all over the world to Palestine to the extent of eroding the culture and sovereign right of the Palestinian people. After the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, 78 per cent of the historical land of Palestine had disappeared. Resolutions that had been adopted recently discriminated against the Palestinians. More than half of Palestinians were refugees.

The delegate of CANADA said that, as parliamentarians, they needed to do more to raise awareness about the needs of indigenous peoples. Aboriginal peoples were under-represented in the Canadian Parliament. She had understood that parliaments were encouraged and expected to adopt plans of action on implementation of the UN Declaration but many had not done so. Several resource development projects were under review that excluded aboriginal peoples. She asked the panellists to give examples of where those plans of actions were being developed and best practices. Was there any mechanism in place to monitor countries' action or inaction?

Grand Chief E. JOHN, Panellist, said that the concept of free, prior and informed consent was embodied in the entire 46 articles of the Declaration. The notion meant involving and engaging indigenous peoples in the earliest stages of a project or legislation, or any other measure. Information had to be provided to indigenous peoples upon which informed decisions could be made. Consent could take different forms. Most of it related to land and resource development but it also applied to administrative measures and legislative initiatives. Some claimed that the Declaration needed to be interpreted within the context of domestic law. That would completely undermine the human rights aspect of the Declaration recognized at the international level. Domestic law should not determine international standards but should complement them rather than minimize or undermine them.

Mr. T. HENARE (New Zealand) said that New Zealand was currently dealing with the issue of water. The Government had put aside 20 per cent participation for the tribes in areas such as aqua farming. They thus got a "cut of the action". Regarding water, the issue of ownership was going to the highest court. They would look carefully at what the courts and the government had to say. The Government had worked diligently to include indigenous peoples in the settlement of resources such as mineral rights.

The delegate of INDIA asked why, in 2007, four countries had voted against the Declaration. Three of them were British dominions – Australia, Canada and New Zealand – and one a former British colony, the United States. The International Labour Organization Convention (ILO) recognized the distinction between indigenous populations and other tribal and semi-tribal populations. That distinction had not been made in the UN Declaration. He requested clarification on the link between Article 3 and Article 46.1 and asked whether self-determination did not run counter to the UN Charter.

Mr. T. HENARE (New Zealand) admitted that New Zealand had not signed the Declaration immediately. It was indeed very interesting that those four nations had not signed it immediately, but he did not know why.

The MODERATOR asked Grand Chief Edward John about the status of preparations for the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples. She felt that the Declaration should be more than aspirational. Efforts should be made to move on to real implementation.

Grand Chief E. JOHN, Panellist, congratulated and applauded the Government of Bolivia on making the Declaration part of its national law. On the question of the modalities, most of it was contained in the resolution. Preparations for the World Conference to be held in Norway in June 2013 were advancing well. The seven regional indigenous caucuses, the indigenous women's caucus and the indigenous caucus would be convening preparatory meetings. Some countries, such as Canada, had unfortunately not taken any steps for the government to meet with the indigenous peoples before the Conference. With respect to the adoption of the Declaration, Canada was notorious for having voted against the Declaration twice but ultimately had endorsed it thanks to the efforts of many members of parliament. In 2011, the United States had endorsed the Declaration.

The delegate of CANADA asked how the Declaration could be implemented and expressed her concern over the use of the word "aspirational". She also asked the delegate of New Zealand if he was also disappointed by the term "aspirational" and how parliamentarians could advance the issue of indigenous peoples.

Mr. T. HENARE (New Zealand) said that he was never disappointed in what the Government or the opposition did. There was ample evidence in his country that indigenous peoples had taken the initiative without waiting for the Government to act. Throughout their history, the indigenous peoples had led the fight. By way of example, one of their initiatives was called "the language nest": the language had been dying and in the mid-1980s, they had decided to establish early childhood centres, essentially as a language nest for no other purpose than to save the language. That had had a remarkable impact on his people. Not long ago, the tribunal had admonished the Government for not doing enough to enhance the early childhood model. Therefore, the Government needed to re-think its vision. He felt that it was cowardly of governments to claim that the Declaration was aspirational because they did not want to take the next step. It was important to educate the whole population.

Mr. H. JENKINS (Australia) said that when he had been Speaker, one of his proudest achievements was the fact that, at the commencement of each sitting day, members of parliament paid their respects to the traditional owners of the land and the elders. It was important to realize that they were experiencing a healing process. Healing and reconciliation were very important steps. Australia had not adopted the Declaration but he believed that the coalition government had not been opposed to it. Failure to act might have been a result of disenchantment with UN mechanisms. The important thing was that the Government had now expressed its support for the Declaration. In terms of language, the Declaration was not legally binding. The Government assumed the responsibility for trying to achieve the principle of the Declaration and bring indigenous peoples to the table. The Government was offering active support for the World Conference and funding to groups wishing to participate. It was a journey they were now taking together. Australia did not have a treaty, like New Zealand. Beyond the political process, there was now a common desire to ensure that the journey was continued hand in hand. A campaign had been launched to close the gap on health and education. Decisions should be made by the indigenous peoples themselves. They should have ownership of their journey.

Mrs. I.D. LUNA ZEBALLOS (Bolivia) observed that western customs prevailed in international relations. Words such as "aspirational", "treaties" and "conventions" were bandied about. From an indigenous perspective, they talked about thankfulness to Mother Earth for food and good health. Their perspective was that it was their responsibility and duty to keep their lands clean, healthy and full of life for the next generations. Their proposals benefited indigenous and non-indigenous peoples alike. That was the message that should be taken back to the civil societies in Canada and Australia.

The MODERATOR thanked the panellists and the delegates for sharing their experiences.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.

Special Gender Partnership Session on Gender-sensitive Parliaments

Sitting of Tuesday 23 October

(Morning)

The session was called to order at 9.30 a.m. with Ms. R. KADAGA (Uganda) and Mr. F. DRILON (Philippines) in the Chair.

The CO-CHAIRS introduced the Moderator of the session, Ms. J. Pandya (IPU) and Ms. S. Palmieri, author of the IPU report *Gender-sensitive Parliaments: A Global Review of Good Practice*.

Ms. R. KADAGA (Uganda), co-Chair, welcomed all the participants and said that parliamentary institutions were designed by men for men and, slowly, women had fought their way. The structures and facilities were not necessarily able to accommodate women.

Mr. F. DRILON (Philippines), co-Chair, informed the delegates that the Special Session was being spearheaded by the IPU Gender Partnership Group, which was a body of the IPU Executive Committee.

Ms. R. KADAGA (Uganda), co-Chair, said that in 2009, the IPU had carried out a global survey of parliaments on gender sensitivity. The report identified the level of gender sensitivity in parliaments and good practices that supported the promotion of women and gender equality in parliament. The goal of that session was to identify objectives and strategies for the achievement of gender equality in parliament. The plan of action for gender-sensitive parliaments would be finalized and adopted at the closing segment of the special session on 26 October. It would then be submitted for adoption by the Assembly later that day. The purpose of the plan was to assist parliaments in taking actions and measures to become gender-sensitive institutions. They wanted it to be a strong and useful tool.

Mr. F. DRILON (Philippines), co-Chair, invited the delegates to describe in one sentence what they considered to be a gender-sensitive parliament. The purpose of that exercise was to get an idea of what parliamentarians understood gender-sensitive parliaments to be. He then introduced the two guests: Ms. Anne MAKINDA (Speaker of the National Assembly of United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. Patrick BURKE (Speaker of the Irish Senate) to present their perspectives on what constituted a gender-sensitive parliament.

Ms. A. MAKINDA (United Republic of Tanzania) indicated that she had become a member of parliament in 1975 and the country's first woman Speaker in 2010. Before that she had served as the first woman Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly of the United Republic of Tanzania.

M. P. BURKE (Ireland) said that he had first been elected to the Senate in 1993. He had also acted as government whip and Deputy Speaker and was currently Speaker.

The MODERATOR asked Mr. Burke if he considered himself to be a gender-sensitive person.

Mr. P. BURKE (Ireland) replied in the affirmative. There were many women senators in the parliament and that he gave more leeway to the women MPs than to their men counterparts.

The MODERATOR asked Mr. Burke what was the most gender insensitive thing he had ever done in his work?

Mr. P. BURKE (Ireland) stated that some years previously, when he was the opposition whip, he had made a comment about the then leader of the government because of something she had done, which was insensitive.

The MODERATOR asked Ms. Makinda to name the most gender-sensitive and gender-insensitive things she had done.

Ms. A. MAKINDA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the most gender-sensitive thing her parliament had done was to pass a law providing for at least 30 per cent women's representation in parliament. Currently, women's representation stood at 36 per cent. She did not remember ever doing something gender-insensitive since she had been advocating for gender sensitivity since independence.

The MODERATOR asked Ms. Makinda if she had encountered any difficulties in her work because she was a woman.

Ms. A. MAKINDA (United Republic of Tanzania) considered that the best way to advance with her work was to forget that she was a woman. She thought of herself as a leader. Women could do anything.

The MODERATOR asked Mr. Burke's opinion on the matter.

Mr. P. BURKE (Ireland) believed that women did things differently from men and in some cases, took things more personally. However, they were getting better at dealing with that and letting go.

The MODERATOR asked Mr. Burke what was the most difficult thing he had to do in parliament as a man.

Mr. P. BURKE (Ireland) responded that he never looked at things from that perspective. In the Irish Senate, over 30 per cent of parliamentarians were woman. He tried to treat everybody the same.

The MODERATOR noted that Ireland ranked 89th in the IPU world ranking in terms of the number of women in parliament. She asked Mr. Burke what kind of issues he had faced when working with women in the Senate.

Mr. P. BURKE (Ireland) responded that Ireland found it difficult to convince women to enter politics. In his political party, when considering candidates for elections, there must be at least one woman per town council. The reason there were more women in the Senate was mainly due to the electoral system, where the Prime Minister appointed 11 candidates to the Senate from the government majority, seven of whom must be women. In the next general elections, each party would have to field 20 per cent of women candidates. A number of issues prohibited women from entering politics, for example the times of parliament sittings, especially for women having to travel from different parts of the country. The Parliament was endeavouring to better accommodate women. They needed to encourage women to enter mainstream politics.

The MODERATOR observed that United Republic of Tanzania ranked 20th in the IPU world ranking in terms of the number of women in parliament, with 36 per cent. She asked Ms. Makinda to describe her experience of being a woman Speaker in a male-dominated parliament?

Ms. A. MAKINDA (United Republic of Tanzania) responded that women had been advocating for their place in parliament for a long time. They had a women's parliamentary caucus, which was very active. They needed to engage the men in their cause so they could understand them better. They tried to make the men understand that women had a place in parliament. There was a gender committee composed exclusively of women members. That did not make sense. They had pushed for women to be represented on all committees and to have men on the gender committee. They were aiming to achieve a representation of 50 per cent women, mainly through affirmative action measures. It was not easy to find women who wanted to be involved in politics. Their traditions were not very women-friendly. The constituents needed to realize that it might actually be in their interest to have a woman representative in some cases. She had done quite well in politics and her experience encouraged other women to get involved. She served as an example and a model to other women, but they faced many challenges. The parliament ran training programmes for women MPs.

The MODERATOR asked Ms. Makinda if she felt that women needed to change their behaviour.

Ms. A. MAKINDA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that they had to change the attitude of women towards women MPs so that women would vote for more women to represent them. They also ran programmes for women MPs to build their confidence and develop their public speaking skills.

The MODERATOR asked Ms. Makinda if her parliament ran programmes targeting men so that they could change their behaviour and attitude towards women.

Ms. A. MAKINDA (United Republic of Tanzania) responded that they always invited their men colleagues to take part in their meetings and programmes.

The MODERATOR asked Ms. Makinda how close she was to achieving her goal of gender parity in parliament, which she had pledged to meet upon becoming Speaker in 2010.

Ms. A. MAKINDA (United Republic of Tanzania) answered that she wanted parliament to work on those issues. There were no male- or female-specific issues. The main issues they were addressing were HIV/AIDS, the rights of the child and the education of girls. The most important vehicle of change regarding gender issues was education. Educated women would not be left behind.

The MODERATOR asked both Speakers what would be the one change they would make if they could in their parliament that would completely transform it in terms of gender equality.

Mr. P. BURKE (Ireland) felt that changing the sitting hours would be very helpful for women MPs and staff. Men and women parliamentarians worked well and very closely together. Amendments to the Standing Orders would be needed to change the sitting days. It would be a dramatic change but perhaps they could suggest a longer sitting week but fewer hours per day. They should not forget that the wheels turned slowly in politics.

Ms. A. MAKINDA (United Republic of Tanzania) answered that an increasing number of new members of parliament were young. Some women members were very young and still of child-bearing age. She made the case for day care facilities to cater to the needs of women MPs with young children while the parliament was in session. That way they could breastfeed their children while still attending to the House business. Her parliament was working on building a village for MPs so that they could be close to their families if they so wished.

The MODERATOR noted that both Speakers believed that the support structures of parliament and its working methods needed to be changed. The difficulty did not seem to be so much in bringing women to parliament as it was in keeping them there. She added that Ms. Makinda had been quoted as saying that there was no law preventing women from showing their capability.

Ms. A. MAKINDA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that women needed to receive a proper education, take chances and not be afraid to make mistakes.

Mr. P. BURKE (Ireland) said that he had been surprised at women's negative reaction to quotas. He believed it was the only way forward but it took some time for women to come around to that notion.

The MODERATOR thanked both panellists for their contribution.

Mr. F. DRILON (Philippines), co-Chair, also thanked both Speakers for giving the participants much food for thought.

Ms. R. KADAGA (Uganda), co-Chair, invited Ms. Sonia Palmieri, author of the Report on Gender-Sensitive Parliaments – A Global Review of Good Practice to present her findings.

Ms. S. PALMIERI thanked both Speakers for setting the tone of the debate. She referred to the research the IPU had been doing on the issue of gender-sensitive parliaments. In 2008, the IPU had produced a survey of women and men in parliaments entitled Equality in Politics. It found overwhelmingly that women were the drivers of change in terms of gender equality in parliament.

Its principal recommendation was that it was time for parliament, as an institution, to assume responsibility for gender equality. The question was how to make parliaments shoulder that responsibility. The above-mentioned global study had begun the process of asking that very question. Interviews had been conducted with men and women MPs, questionnaires had been distributed and 17 national case studies had been carried out in each quarter of the globe. The IPU's definition of a gender-sensitive parliament was "one that responded to the needs, interests, of both men and women in its structures, operations, methods and in its work". It could refer to the number of women in parliament, its structures, committees, caucuses and the overall environment. Those were the predominant areas identified in defining a gender-sensitive parliament. Men and women had an equal right to participate without discrimination or recrimination. Yet there were many barriers to women's representation. The fact that parliament, as an institution, was representative of its nation, stood it in good stead to serve as a role model. It was a workplace that should be attractive to women and a place that inspired women to become parliamentarians.

In order to achieve that goal, six difficult steps would have to be taken, namely: increase the number of women in parliament and in positions of parliamentary leadership; develop a legal and policy framework for gender equality; make sure that gender equality became the mainstream through the work of parliament; make sure the culture of the parliament and its infrastructure were gender-sensitive; acknowledge that men had been working towards gender equality, build on that, and build on political parties; and make sure that parliamentary staff had expertise in gender equality and could assist parliamentarians with those concerns. Electing women to parliament did not happen without political will. It also did not happen unless political parties were supportive of women. In some parts of the world the passing of legislation might be required to change electoral laws or the Constitution. When women were elected, it was important to ensure that they became committee chairpersons and held leadership positions. That could be done through affirmative action measures and changes to internal rules. A critical mass of women in parliament made it easier to appoint them to leadership positions.

Parliaments had found it difficult to implement change regarding a framework for gender equality. Where such legal frameworks did exist that had been made possible through gender equality laws. Those contained two key components: a policy component on non-discrimination of women in employment matters, health or education, and the process by which gender equality concerns were mainstreamed through legislation and budgets. That component was not always present, especially in old laws. Constitutions did not generally tend to be sterling examples of a gender equality policy. A policy document set a direction for gender equality, identified objectives and indicators, as well as a plan of action that outlined activities. It could include a code of conduct to define what was considered as acceptable behaviour. Some policies specifically prohibited discrimination or harassment. Those often existed for staff, but not for women MPs.

Gender mainstreaming took place in some parliaments very successfully, in others not so much. That required a gender assessment, structures, tools and mechanisms as well as sex-disaggregated data. The culture and infrastructure of parliaments were crucial to promoting women's participation in politics. In some parliaments, women did not feel comfortable or accepted. Certain language could be made gender-neutral, such as chair rather than chairman. The survey had found that the greatest challenge was ensuring a family life/work balance. Not all parliaments gave MPs parental leave on the birth of their children and young men parliamentarians were increasingly requesting parental leave. In addition, not all parliaments had a childcare area or breastfeeding spaces. Men had been working towards gender equality, which was a positive trend. They were sponsoring legislation, chairing committees and participating in gender equality activities. They were raising the issue themselves. Political parties were not always gender-sensitive and needed to be further encouraged. They needed to develop gender equality policies and monitor and evaluate their work. Greater effort must be made to help parliamentary staff fully grasp the importance of achieving gender equality. They must make sure that men and women were equally represented in senior leadership positions in the parliamentary administration. Links must be developed between parliament and gender experts outside parliament such as think-tanks, universities and civil society organizations. Training must be available as well as women-friendly working conditions. She invited the delegates to share their experiences.

Ms. P. CAYETANO (Philippines) said that her country had elected two women presidents, so electing women was not an issue in the Philippines. However, more women should be elected to parliament as the percentage of women represented in both Houses of Parliament was quite low. She felt that a gender-sensitive parliament was one where issues affecting women could be discussed openly

and respectfully, such as those concerning children, prostitution, maternal deaths and breastfeeding. Often when women got up in parliament to discuss those issues, their male colleagues made derogatory remarks and snickered. Yet children's rights and prostitution were no laughing matter. On a more positive note, she indicated that she also worked with male colleagues who were very supportive and respectful. There were only three women senators out of a total of 23 senators in the Philippines Senate. She had permitted many of her staff to breastfeed their children in the workplace but was unaware if that was a common practice in other parliaments. That should become a more institutionalized practice.

Ms. S. ABDALLA (Kenya) said that one of the greatest challenges of gender-sensitivity on the African continent is the absence of an enabling environment for gender equality to translate commitments into action. Kenya is perhaps at the beginning of the beginning. The 2010 new Kenyan constitution has included specific measures, including ensuring that at least 4 women out of 9 members are represented in the parliamentary service commission, the top policy making body. What else should gender sensitive parliaments do? They need to establish mechanisms to facilitate gender mainstreaming development and therefore initiate legislation and policies that will make a positive difference in the lives of women and other marginalized groups. They need to address gender unbalance and inequality and embrace the fact that women deserve equal opportunity and equal access to education, health care and housing. The gender question is above all a human development issue. For this transformation of society to occur, the Constitution and laws have their limitations. It is important that all progressive parliaments within the IPU community always advocate for enactment of legislation and policies that are gender neutral and free from any form of discrimination.

Ms. S. HAJ HASAN (Jordan) said that Jordan's Constitution clearly established equality between men and women. The election laws had undergone gradual improvements to increase women's participation in the House of Representatives. In 1955, only educated women had been granted the right to vote. In 1974, that right had been granted to all women. To increase women's participation in parliament, quotas had been introduced in the election law of 2003. In 2010, the number of seats held by women had increased to 12, and then to 13 in 2012. As a result, the percentage of women parliamentarians had risen from 1.25 per cent in 1993 to 10.8 per cent in 2012. In the Senate, where members were appointed by the King, the percentage of women senators had increased from 5 per cent in 1993 to 11.7 per cent in 2010. Women's membership of political parties had risen from 6.8 per cent in 2005 to 28.8 per cent in 2007. The 2012 law stressed the principle of equality and stipulated that all political parties should have at least 10 per cent women members. Their goal was to increase women's participation to at least 30 per cent in decision-making positions, and gradually reach 50 per cent participation.

Ms. T. BOONTONG (Thailand) said that gender equality needed to be fostered throughout the world. In 1932, women's right to vote had been enshrined in Thailand's first Constitution. The people had elected the first woman member of parliament in 1949. Gender equality was also guaranteed in the Constitution. The Thai Parliament had not achieved numerical gender equality: women accounted for 15.82 per cent of the membership of the House of Representatives and 16 per cent of the Senate. The Senate had continued its landmark gender-sensitive tradition of having a woman presiding officer. Women parliamentarians were role models for other women as they offered encouragement and became actively involved in the political arena. She believed that for parliaments to become gender-sensitive they needed to be supported by a gender sensitive society. Actions needed to be taken to build-up and strengthen the role of women throughout society. A number of laws had been reviewed and amended, contributing to women's rights and reflecting the recommendations made by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women. The findings of the 2011 Grant Thornton International Business Report had revealed that Thai women occupied the largest number of senior managerial positions within the private sector worldwide. The Thai Parliament also organised gender-sensitive activities to enhance awareness. A continuing project on gender-responsive budgeting had also been set-up. Parliaments needed to carry forth the continued use of quota systems to ensure that the number of women candidates matched that of men candidates.

Ms. Z. BOUAYAD (Morocco) indicated that the political reform in Morocco included equality at all levels. The most recent 2011 Constitution had guaranteed gender equality. Efforts had been made to promote gender equality in parliament. Women's representation in the Lower House of the Moroccan Parliament currently stood at 17 per cent. They had found that women's representation at the regional

level in the Senate was very low and difficult to increase. A law on affirmative action had been put in place so that women could take part in regional councils. It also stipulated that women should account for at least 30 per cent of posts at the different administrative levels. In the medical field, 60 per cent of doctors were women. Laws had been amended and legislation introduced to promote the gender equality. Morocco was making great efforts to achieve political and gender equality reforms gradually and peacefully.

Ms. A. ESHETE (Ethiopia) said that in Ethiopia, according to recent statistics, women represented almost 50 per cent of the population. The country had 81 ethnic groups with diverse social norms, cultural practices and religions. That made the issue of gender and gender equality even more complex and sensitive. Without the participation of women, the development of political, economic, and social activity was impossible. In the past 21 years, tangible measures and actions had been taken by the Ethiopian Government to create an enabling environment for gender equality and a gender-sensitive parliament. The number of women parliamentarians in leadership positions had increased. Women's representation in the federal parliament had risen from 2.3 per cent in 1996 to 27.8 per cent in 2010. The number of woman represented at the regional and municipal level had soared from 29 to 50 per cent. Women occupied 13 per cent of ministerial posts, 8.3 per cent of state ministerial portfolios and 25 per cent of commissioner posts. More emphasis had been placed on gender in the country's five-year strategic plan. Women should cooperate at the national, regional and the international levels.

Ms. Z. BENAROUS (Algeria) started by correcting some facts contained in the report on women's representation at the international level. In Algeria, a balanced participation between men and women had been achieved in society. The 1963 Constitution did not contain any discriminatory provisions based on gender in terms of rights or duties. Today, Algeria ranked very high in terms of women's representation. In both Houses of Parliament, 30 per cent representation had been achieved. Three committees were presided over by women out of a total of nine. The ministry for women's affairs had been merged with the ministry for family because there was no difference between men and women in the political field. She concluded by informing the delegates that Algeria was celebrating 50 years of independence.

Mr. S. ALNAMLAH (Saudi Arabia) said that gender equality was as important as justice. He wished that the report would place greater emphasis on the question of education, especially at the higher education level. In the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, women represented 49 per cent of the population. At the university level, 16 per cent of undergraduates were women. The country was working hard to achieve equality. There was a strong belief in Saudi Arabia that they could not achieve a developed society without gender balance.

Ms. S. BARAKZAI (Afghanistan) said that in the past seven years Afghanistan had made many gains, notably ensuring women's empowerment and making the parliament more gender-sensitive. That had been achieved thanks to the efforts of great women in Afghanistan and by virtue of the Constitution. It was important to support women. Reforms were needed to electoral laws and political parties based on equal opportunity. Parliament must represent all the citizens of the country: men and women. That was a mammoth task that would require a great deal of patience.

Mr. J.K. MANI (India) said that a gender-sensitive parliament was one that responded to the needs and interests of both women and men in its composition, structure, systems and practices. It was one that made sure that its operations and resources were used effectively to promote gender equality. In the recent past, India had elected a woman President. Today, it boasted a woman Speaker of Parliament. The Constitution provided for 33 per cent of women in local bodies. Women accounted for 11 per cent of the membership in the Lok Sabha. The leader of the opposition was also a woman. Women held leadership positions in the major political parties. Parliament needed to reflect gender equality in its law-making and oversight functions. Parliament had passed numerous laws addressing issues such as violence against women, trafficking in women, nutrition and health care, to name but a few. In the recent years, women's empowerment had been recognized as a central issue in determining the status of women. The Government of India had launched a National Mission for the Empowerment of Women in view of empowering them socially, economically and educationally. The National Commission for Women had been set up in 1992 to safeguard the rights of women. In 2005, gender budgeting had been introduced as a tool to mainstream gender into all aspects of administration and programmes.

Ms. A.T. TALEBANI (Iraq) said that guaranteeing equality was the responsibility of both men and women. In the Iraqi Parliament, women represented 25.2 per cent of the total membership; it ranked 45th in the world in terms of women's representation. It came in second in the Middle-East and fourth among the Arab parliaments. The Constitution provided for at least 25 per cent women's representation in parliament and guaranteed gender equality and equal participation in political life. Women were well represented on parliamentary committees but less so as chairpersons. Women had played an important role in visiting Syrian refugees at the border. An important accomplishment had been the reform of the election laws for provinces: women were now guaranteed at least 25 per cent representation at the regional and municipal levels. They were working on amending the law on political parties to enhance the rights of women in political parties. They had to make sure that women were present in the political parties and among their leadership. More women were needed in parliament but also women with leadership qualities who could stand up for women's rights and resist negative influence.

Lord DHOLAKIA (United Kingdom) reminded the delegates that people had struggled for a very long time to achieve equality and in many countries were still lagging behind. He referred to the young girl from Pakistan who had been shot because she had demanded an education. The important thing was the outcomes. In order to achieve tangible deliverables, the following were required: a clear policy statement; strict application across the board of the policy; monitoring; training; and affirmative action. Equality of opportunity must first of all be enshrined in the constitution so as to ensure that gender issues were granted prime importance in developing a healthy and stable society equipped to fight poverty, ignorance, and discrimination.

Ms. R. MUKANTABANA (Rwanda) said that Rwanda had the highest number of women in parliament: 56 per cent in the lower chamber and 38.5 per cent in the Senate. Those results had been achieved because of political will. The Constitution provided quotas for women's representation: 24 seats were reserved for women, with a minimum stipulation of 30 per cent women's representation. In addition, candidates on party lists must be evenly distributed. There were no problems with gender sensitivity in Rwanda: women were represented in parliament and in leadership positions. What was the relevance of having a high number of women in parliament? It was easier to pass legislation that concerned women and facilitate the country's economic growth. She advised other parliaments to introduce the quota system, which she had found to be particularly effective.

Ms. S.M. ESCUDERO (Argentina) said that Argentina was the first country in the world to take affirmative action through legislation passed in 1991. That law had made it mandatory for political parties to include women and to have a threshold of 30 per cent of women candidates on their electoral lists. In order for parties to meet that obligation, judges were empowered to make amendments to party lists. Argentina ranked 18th in the world in terms of women's representation, with 37 per cent women members in the Chamber of Deputies and 38.9 per cent women members in the Senate. They had been able to make progress in the workplace by adjusting working hours and having a day-care centre on site for parliamentarians and staff. The Senate had a standing committee for all women to ensure that all bills were gender-sensitive. The President of Argentina was a woman and was responsible for significant advances but a great deal still remained to be done. Rules and procedures had to be amended to ensure gender equality across the board.

Ms. M. AL BAHAR (United Arab Emirates) talked about her country's experience in terms of women's empowerment and participation in politics. Political participation was a basic right for both men and women and was enshrined in the Constitution. The country upheld the basic concept of women's empowerment, which it felt was a continuous process that should be reflected at all levels of society. A women's union had been formed to spread the culture of political participation and heighten awareness of gender equality issues. While it was true that legislation was needed it was often not sufficient on its own. Greater awareness of women's participation in society at large had to be raised. In traditional Arab cultures, the status quo had to be challenged. That was why the government had ensured that there was legislation, awareness and specialized establishments and institutions to work on those issues. The Deputy Speaker of the UAE Parliament was a woman and many committee chairpersons were women. There was real participation by women but the country had not fully accomplished its goals.

Ms. M. MENSAH-WILLIAMS (Namibia) said that the time for rhetoric was over. Measures such as quotas were needed. They needed more women in parliament and they needed to prepare them. She asked how attractive parliament seemed for women. How did women go about changing parliament? Women's participation changed the way the parliament debated certain issues and changed the laws that were passed. Child care facilities were needed to attract young women to parliament. In Namibia, a caucus of rural women had been established. Those women would be encouraged to participate in next elections. Different voting systems within political parties must also be introduced, such as the zebra list and gender-sensitive budgets were essential. IPU Members should be privy to a greater number of reports on the situation in other parliaments.

Ms. N. ASKRI (Tunisia) said that in Tunisia, women represented half of the population and should thus be duly represented in parliament. Legislation must address the needs of all citizens: men, women and children. Political parties had agreed to greater women's participation through the constituent assembly. It had increased the women's participation to 26 per cent. Women now chaired certain parliamentary committees. Yet women often participated in political life at the expense of their family. Parliament needed to be reformed to better meet the needs of women and their families.

Ms. M. ISASI (Chile) said that gender sensitivity was a huge challenge. Chile had experienced a real revolution by electing Michelle Bachelet as President with a parity cabinet, an equal amount of men and women ministers. Today, of a total of 120 parliamentarians, only 17 were women. Women represented 52 per cent of the Chilean population. Most were well-educated, but it was hard to move forward from a political standpoint. Not many women sat on parliamentary committees and only three women, in the history of their parliament, had been elected Speaker. The country needed to establish and embrace more progressive policies.

Ms. I. AL-WAZIR (Palestine) said that in Palestine, it was not a question of gender rights but a question of equal and universal rights. The Constitution guaranteed gender equality and non-discrimination. In the First National Council women had managed to obtain five seats. In the Second National Council, they had achieved 20 per cent representation. Yet that was considered to be insufficient to represent Palestinian women. Women had asked for the quota to be increased to 30 per cent and had felt it was important to have women participate in decision-making. She asked that the Map on Women in Politics distributed today be changed to reflect the presence of women in decision-making positions: ministers, governors and judges, among other top posts.

Mr. NHEM THAVY (Cambodia) indicated that Cambodia had a gender sensitive parliament: 21 per cent of parliamentarians were women, 22 per cent of committee chairpersons were women and 20 per cent were members of expert commissions. Cambodia was pressing to achieve a target of 30 per cent women's representation by 2015. However, it was not possible to pass a law to force that target, as that would be unconstitutional. The National Assembly and the Government were committed to gender equality in all areas of the legislature.

Ms. R. MOMA BOKONDA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) stated that equal participation by men and women in national and provincial institutions was enshrined in the Congolese Constitution. The country still had a long way to go to achieve equality, owing to the low level of education and training among Congolese women, a lack of confidence and encouragement, and cultural attitudes in some provinces that limited women's role. Currently, women accounted for almost 10 per cent of the membership of the National Assembly and 6 per cent of the Senate. Only six women held ministerial positions in the central government (16 of the cabinet), and each provincial government had one woman in cabinet. Women must be given opportunities and training as well as the means to get elected and be well represented in parliament.

Ms. G. REQUENA (Venezuela) said that gender sensitivity was a priority in her country. It was a tall order that would mean going against 5,000 years of history and patriarchal attitudes towards women. The Venezuelan Parliament was working hard to build a culture that would give women equal space. The Deputy Speaker was a woman as were 28 parliamentarians and 39 titular committee members. However, there was only one woman committee chair. They were building a culture of equality and saw themselves as a peace-loving society that worked towards equality. The country strove to increase leadership opportunities for women and admitted that more must be done.

Ms. H. ESUENE (Nigeria) said that the Parliament of Nigeria was very young: only 13 years old. The country had a presidential multi-party system. All representatives were elected. There were many traditional constraints against women, but those walls were gradually crumbling and men were being very supportive. Women accounted for 6.8 per cent of members of parliament. Most committees had women chairpersons or deputy chairpersons. An equal opportunity bill was currently before both chambers. Men were still shying away from affirmative action. The Constitution was currently under review and women hoped to use that opportunity to make sure that a law would be passed to enable women to fill more positions in the elected chambers. Women were politically aware of what was needed.

Ms. J. NASSIF (Bahrain) said that in spite of the fact that democracy was relatively new in Bahrain, there had been many positive developments. Policies had been adopted that were supportive of women and responsive to their needs. Women played a significant role in decision-making positions.

Ms. S. MOULENGUI-MOUELE (Gabon) stated that there were 36 women in her country's parliament: 18 in the Senate and an equal number in the National Assembly. Women also held the positions of President of the Constitutional Court, Budget Minister and President of the Senate. In terms of participation in public and political life, the law gave women the right to vote. Women must be able to assume their responsibility and defend their rights. Women's rights went hand-in-hand with skills and ability. Women parliamentarians had formed networks in each house of the legislature to help reaffirm women's participation and build capacity. There must be solidarity and discrimination must be eliminated.

Ms. J. FOTSO (Cameroon) stated that women on every continent faced the same problems although to varying degrees. In Cameroon, women parliamentarians tended to be older and many came from rural areas. Sessions were not held year round. There were three one-month sessions per year. The real difficulty for women lay in getting elected to parliament. Women often chose not to enter politics because that meant fighting against tradition. Economic power constituted another major obstacle: most women did not have the means to finance an election campaign. A network of parliamentarians had been established to raise awareness of gender issues. They lobbied political parties to get them to field women candidates so that they could participate fully. Gender must be taken into account under the new election code, which had not been the case previously.

Ms. M. NAKABAYASHI (Japan) said that Japan recognized that the IPU was one of the foremost organizations to rank women's participation in parliaments in the world. According to its evaluation, Japan ranked 109th in the world. Although the country had a long history of democracy, women accounted for merely 10.8 per cent of members in the lower house, and 18.6 per cent in the upper house. Campaigning for election to the lower house was very difficult for women and political parties were not adapting to women's needs. Culturally it was very difficult to adopt quotas. The international example could bring pressure to bear on Japan for enhanced women's representation. Women had similar interests; the issue was not gender but the agenda. If all women in the world had a similar agenda, they would be able to find a way to cooperate. If there were more women representatives, international relations would change and lead the world towards peace.

Ms. M. PIGEM (Spain) said that women's participation was not just a political opportunity but also justice because women represented more than half of the global population. In Spain, women represented 36 per cent of the elected positions in the Cortes. The reform of the electoral law was important for parity representation on party lists. Parity had to be respected for three or four candidates out of five. In addition, the internal quotas for political parties were very important. Access and distribution of positions in parliament were equally important. She was partial to the suggestion to amend parliament's standing orders. Legislation must permit co-responsibility for men and women in their public and private life.

Ms. V. KALIMA (Zambia) said that it was accepted that parliament should have an equitable representation of men and women so that it could accurately represent the composition of society and take women's interests into consideration. The Zambian Constitution recognized the full equality of women and men. However there were still many obstacles to women's participation, not least the

electoral system. In addition, there was limited access to productive resources. In the 2011 general election, only 18 women had been elected to parliament. Four of those women were cabinet ministers and six were deputy ministers. There was a women's parliamentary caucus which was involved in activities to build the capacity of women and enhance their participation. Ensuring the full participation of women in parliament required affirmative action and policies.

Ms. S. FERNANDOPULLE (Sri Lanka) said that their indicators suggested that there was no discrimination in Sri Lanka: women lived longer and more of them obtained a secondary and tertiary education than men. Women had achieved suffrage in 1931 and the Constitution provided for equal opportunities for men and women. Although the country had elected a women President in the 1960s, women accounted for a mere 5.8 per cent of members of parliament. It was difficult to be nominated as candidates and to compete against male counterparts. The attitude towards women entering politics was very negative. The women's caucus had prepared an action plan to promote and motivate women. The youth parliaments were quite active and helped boys and girls to promote equal opportunity. They needed to engage male counterparts in gender sensitivity efforts if they wanted to be successful.

Ms. B. AMONGI (Uganda) observed that Uganda currently boasted 35 per cent women's representation in parliament and had a woman Speaker. It was important to have good women members and to stress that not all women wanted to be in leadership positions. They had been able to change the rules of procedure in parliament to state that 40 per cent of leadership positions on committees must go to women. Thirty per cent of positions approved by parliament went to women. Parliament needed to accommodate women's needs by establishing breastfeeding centres, flexible travel policies and maternity leave.

Ms. B. BOUPHA (Lao People's Democratic Republic) noted that gender equality was recognized in the 1990 Constitution. In the last election, 25 per cent of women had been elected. The National Assembly had established a women's parliamentary caucus that developed strategies to promote a gender-sensitive parliament and conduct gender analyses on committees, the cabinet and the 17 constituencies. Their findings should be published the following year. Their intention was to increase women's representation to 30 per cent in next election.

Ms. M.A.B GINI (Bangladesh) stated that society's balance depended on the responsible participation of men and women in all aspects of society. Women's experience was essential to reinforce gender justice through the promotion of a fair political system and legal reform in post-conflict situations. In addition, the participation of women in peacekeeping efforts could have a profound impact on stability and conflict resolution. Women in many parts of the world continued to be denied their right to participate in the work of parliament. Governments should actively incorporate women into the political process. Women in Bangladesh had become more politically visible in the past decades: the country had elected women prime ministers for the past 18 years. The number of women candidates participating in the 2008 elections had broken all previous records. A total of 69 women were represented in the national parliament. The presence of those women MPs made it possible to highlight women's issues and promote equal rights for all citizens.

Ms. S. GANOUR (Libya) indicated that the Libyan Parliament was virtually a newborn at 3 months. In spite of that, women had managed to obtain 33 out of a total of 200 seats. The constitution was still in the making but there was a provisional constitutional declaration. Women were free to be represented in society as judges, lawyers and ministers, among many other positions. Women were present in the current cabinet and five women ministers were proposed for the new government. Women were strongly involved in political life and would continue to make strides.

Ms. U. KARLSSON (Sweden) said that it was good to hear of many positive examples, which brought hope that there would be more blue spots representing women on the Map in the future. Decisions needed to be taken by both men and women. It was a shame that more than half the population was not represented in decision-making spheres. It was important to have affirmative action in the presented action plan and more facilities in parliament. In Sweden, 45 per cent of parliamentarians were women and those figures had been attained without legislation on quotas. The country had great hopes for the future but there was still a lot of room for progress. Numbers in themselves were insufficient, women needed to have power in parliament and thus be in leadership

positions. Parliaments needed to change to accommodate a more balanced life in terms of hours of sitting, voting times and day-care facilities. It was still difficult to have a family life and be a parliamentarian.

Ms. J.A. GENTER (New Zealand) stated that New Zealand had been the first country to give women the right to vote in 1893. In 1996, a proportional voting system had been introduced and had initially significantly increased the number of women MPs. In 1998, both the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition had been women and for a time in 2005 the five most powerful positions in the country had been held by women. In recent years, there had been a backwards slide. In the current parliament, just under a third of parliamentarians were women. There was more work to be done and the political parties had a significant role to play. There were no laws on gender balance in political parties. Yet they must not become complacent; achieving gender equality was an ongoing process and the IPU's work was very encouraging.

Ms. S. KOUKOUMA KOUTRA (Cyprus) indicated that in Cyprus, women accounted for 52 per cent of the population but only six out of 56 MPs were women. There were four women ministers out of 11 ministerial posts. In addition, the European Commissioner was a woman. There were now more women than men in universities. She did not believe that things would be changed through quotas alone; mentalities and processes also had to change. Parliament needed to promote issues related to women.

Mr. H. JENKINS (Australia) said that Australia had federated in 1901 and for the first 40 years of its existence had had no women's representation until 1943. By 1980, the House of Representatives had only 3 per cent women's representation. Ten years ago it had reached 25 per cent and had remained static for the past four elections. They could not afford to be complacent; they needed to continue to meet the challenges that prevented the journey towards equity in representation. There had been a change in culture in the way parliament was run: the space that was now the day-care centre used to be the members' bar. The parliament now allowed nursing mothers to vote by proxy if they could not reach the chamber to vote. There had been some indications that many political parties would introduce quota systems as an incentive for women. Some political parties in Australia selected mentors to assist women candidates; that was a valuable notion. Many of his role models and mentors when he first started in parliament had been women. Today in Australia there was a woman Governor General who was a powerful role model. The current Prime Minister of Australia was a woman as well as the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The IPU had set the pace for gender representation.

Ms. S. HUSEYNOVA (Azerbaijan) said that today's discussion was of great social importance. Gender equality was the building block of any democratic society. A number of European countries had long-standing experience in formalizing national policy aimed at eliminating gender discrimination and establishing real social equality between men and women. Today, women in Europe were active in all spheres of life: business, financial affairs and the military. In spite of the positive results achieved, there were too many resolutions and decisions that had not been enforced yet. There was still a lot of work to be done. Azerbaijan had had many successes in protecting women's rights. The 20th century heralded a new era in the life of women in Azerbaijan. In 1918, Azerbaijan, as the first democratic republic in the Muslim world, had given women the right of active and passive vote. In modern Azerbaijan, there were no fields where women were not present. They were present in law enforcement, in the judiciary, in business and in politics. In the 2009 municipal elections, seven times more women had been elected than in 2004. Women represented half of the workforce of civil servants and in the scientific field. Most doctors and school teachers were women. Of the 125 members of parliament 20 were women. The Deputy Speaker of Parliament was a woman. In addition, the Ombudsperson and the Minister for Family, Children and Women Affairs were women. Every five years, forums took place to discuss the position and role of women in Azerbaijan society. Although there had been a lot of progress, there were still serious problems relating to gender and the status of women, the most notable being refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs). In its first year of independence, Azerbaijan had faced acts of aggression, resulting in one million citizens becoming refugees in their own country. More than 50 per cent of those IDPs were women. It was with great concern that, despite the adoption of resolutions by international organizations supporting the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan, the rights of women IDPs had not been restored. She was hopeful that women parliamentarians would take a more active role in resolving conflict all over the world and appealed for their support.

Ms. R. BENMASSAOUD (Morocco) stated that as a result of the political and democratic process currently underway in Morocco, the women's movement and the political will, gender-related issues were on the agenda and had been on the rise, spearheaded by the Socialist Party. Gender budgeting had been established, as had been a committee for equity and equal opportunity and the enforcement of women's rights. In the last elections, women's participation had increased from 10 to 17 per cent, which fell short of their target ambition but still represented one step forward in their long journey. One of the eight committee chairs was a woman. Changes to parliament's Standing Orders would include a committee on equity to increase those numbers. Affirmative action measures must be used to remove obstacles that prevented the participation of women. Morocco supported the IPU in its efforts.

Ms. V. NYIRAHBINEZA (East African Legislative Assembly - EALA) said that EALA had celebrated its 10th anniversary the previous year. The Assembly was currently composed of nine representatives from each Member State, thus 45 members from all five Member States. Currently, the Assembly had 19 women out of 45 members and the first ever woman Speaker. Since taking up her position in June, she had already made many positive changes in terms of gender equality. A women's forum aimed at promoting gender equality had been set up. Its mission was to fight for women's rights and make sure that women enjoyed equal opportunities to men. It intended to organize special training programmes for women to excel in developing pieces of legislation on gender sensitivity and push the integration process forward.

Ms. B. AL JESHI (Transitional Arab Parliament) said that the Transitional Arab Parliament represented many parliaments with wide-ranging experiences. Politics varied from one country to the other but most Arab constitutions provided for political rights for women and the principle of equality. Application of those principles and the performance of parliaments also varied from one Arab country to the other. Some parliaments had established special committees to review laws and legislation in order to weed out discrimination. Others had adopted quota systems. Women's performance also varied from one parliament to the other. Each parliament had to evaluate its own experiences. A lot of work still remained to be done and they were still in transition.

Ms. R. KADAGA (Uganda), co-Chair, thanked the delegates for sharing good practices and highlighting problem areas.

Ms. S. PALMIERI concurred that she had heard many good initiatives and challenges. The purpose of that Special Session was to examine the plan of action and adopt it at least by consensus on Friday to ensure that parliaments took the measures needed to become more gender-sensitive.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

Special Gender Partnership Session on Gender-sensitive Parliaments

Sitting of Friday 26 October

(Morning)

Consideration of reports from the break-out groups and presentation of the Plan of Action for Gender-sensitive Parliaments

The meeting was called to order at 9.30 a.m. with Ms. Rebecca KADAGA (Uganda) and Mr. Franklin DRILON (Philippines) in the Chair.

The CO-CHAIRS invited the rapporteurs of each of the break-out groups to present their reports

Ms. F. MUKAKALISA (Rwanda), rapporteur of group one, presented the group's findings. Delegates had been asked to describe how their respective parliaments addressed gender equality. Everyone agreed that men and women needed to work together on those issues and several had pledged to ensure that women were represented in all parliamentary committees. It had also been suggested that statutory provisions should be established guaranteeing that all legislation be analysed from a gender perspective. It was important to provide gender awareness training to parliamentarians and parliamentary staff. In terms of challenges, in some countries women's participation continued to be very low. Parliamentarians needed to play a greater role in overseeing legislation and parliamentary activities. Standardization also posed a challenge. Women's participation was not always sufficient. Some parliaments were still young and finding their feet and needed more time to integrate a gender perspective. It might be useful for experienced women parliamentarians to mentor other women in order to show them the ropes. That way, they would encourage other women to enter politics.

Ms. M. ANDRÉ (France), rapporteur of group two, presented her group's findings. That group had been chaired by Senator Atallahjan of Canada. Five specific issues had been raised: parliamentary culture; negative stereotypes about women in Parliament; visibility given to gender issues; work/family balance; and internal policies in parliaments on eliminating harassment and discrimination.

It was noted that a neutral vocabulary was needed to include women parliamentarians or presiding officers. Some delegates acknowledged that journalists often exhibited sexist attitudes about women parliamentarians. Sexism needed to be condemned. It was important to train journalists about gender issues. Several delegates proposed establishing more considerate sitting hours, flexible parental leave, more accommodating parliamentary schedules and better timing of votes. Others recommended providing training, particularly for new parliamentarians, to better inform them about parliamentary rules and the benefit of networking quickly in order to fit in easily.

Ms. B. AMONGI (Uganda), rapporteur of group three, reported on the conclusions of her group. The group had discussed building parliamentary capacity to address gender issues. Common areas of concern were identified that, nonetheless, required tailored responses to suit the realities of different parliaments. Five main areas had been discussed: designing gender equality policies and plans of action; enhancing the capacity to mainstream gender; ensuring sound gender equality outcomes; evaluating gender sensitivity; and building a new generation of gender-sensitive parliamentarians.

It was found that a relevant legal framework was lacking in most parliaments. There needed to be a gender agenda within each parliament. Other policies, such as anti-harassment and anti-discrimination policies, also need to be reviewed or developed where they did not exist. Sometimes those were in place for staff but not for parliamentarians. Women caucuses' had a key role to play in gender training and awareness. The concern of gender responsibility – which did not only fall to women – had also been raised. Parliament as an institution needed to share the responsibility and provide gender expertise and capacity-building to its members. Parliamentarians had a key role to play and should use media to showcase positive examples and success stories.

Ms. R. KADAGA (Uganda), co-Chair, asked the delegates to complete the self-assessment form. Through it the IPU proposed to assist parliaments in assessing their level of gender sensitivity.

Ms. S. PALMIERI, Author of the IPU Report on Gender-sensitive Parliaments, made a presentation on gender self-assessments in parliament. She said that the past meetings had helped identify things parliaments still needed to do, but the first step was to evaluate what already existed. The IPU had invested a great deal of time and effort by developing and producing a self-assessment toolkit. That toolkit had been developed based on the findings of a survey used to produce a handbook for parliamentarians on Parliament and democracy in the 21st century: A guide to good practice. It had been used in a number of parliaments to assess their more mainstream issues. Its purpose was not to rank parliaments but rather to identify gaps. Unfortunately, that toolkit did not focus on gender equality but the methodology was valid. The IPU encouraged parliaments to talk about the status of gender equality in their institution. It was developing a gender self-assessment methodology. It was a process that involved preparation and the parliaments of Rwanda, Uganda, Chile, and Bangladesh had experienced that first hand. For a successful assessment, support was needed from the leadership as well as a shared understanding of the purpose and outcome of the process. Participants and representation need to be as diverse as possible. It was useful to have a strategic plan for the parliament and to ascertain whether gender sensitivity was included as an objective. The manner in which the results (report or other) would be implemented also had to be determined beforehand. The objective of the toolkit is to identify ways and means of improving gender sensitivity in parliaments.

Debate

Ms. J. FRASER (Canada) referred to the draft plan of action, which she considered to be a very important but imperfect document. Every issue it addressed was very real. The document provided avenues for solutions to problems that existed around the world. There was no parliament, except perhaps for Rwanda, that was entirely gender sensitive. There was always room for improvement. If the plan of action was adopted by the IPU that would once again demonstrate that the IPU was, and continued to be, a pioneer in advancing women's rights and gender equality.

Ms. M. ANDRÉ (France) drew the delegates' attention to a problem of principle. The document in itself was excellent yet the ideal of gender equality in parliaments was a principle towards which everyone must strive every day. There had been a moment of confusion during the previous day's debate when a colleague had expressed ideas that were completely contrary to the principle of equality. Regrettably, in certain countries gender equality was not an objective. Perhaps the IPU should develop a card system to sanction infractions committed by Members who did not uphold the Organization's ideals.

Ms. S. HAJ HASAN (Jordan) concurred on the significance of the plan of action. It would not only serve as a guideline but would clearly take into account cultural, and social and religious specificities. They must remember that their parliaments represented their societies. Many countries, such as Jordan, had introduced quota systems for women. Had that system not been in place, there would not be so many women in parliament. They must make sure that women were also represented in other institutions. Gender equality must be built into the education system and integrated into all components of the State budget.

Ms. J. CROWDER (Canada) indicated that the plan of action was a step in the right direction. She asked if the assessment tool would be made available to all parliaments. It would be a valuable exercise for all parliaments to conduct a gender-sensitivity self-assessment. That would help them develop gender equality action plans that not many parliaments, including the Canadian Parliament, had in place. It was important to bring pressure to bear on political parties and the government and to learn from others' experiences.

Ms. I. AL-WAZIR (Palestine) said that in Palestine, women had managed to obtain 17 seats in parliament through the quota system. Her society was still male-dominated and women's role in the political arena was still not sufficiently recognized. Women had to fight for equality and greater participation.

Ms. V. NYIRAHBINEZA (East African Legislative Assembly – EALA) said that EALA was still very much a fledgling parliament and had not yet debated gender equality or developed relevant legislation. They needed to build strong partnerships between women caucuses everywhere in order to influence policies, legislation and programmes aimed at promoting gender equality. She appealed to the IPU to help them build those important partnerships and share experiences.

The CHAIR declared the debate closed.

Ms. S. PALMIERI, Author, answered that the toolkit should be ready by the end of the year and the IPU would be pleased to assist parliaments in conducting a self-assessment. The IPU was open to the EALA recommendation about establishing a partnership of women caucuses. On some levels, that sort of alliance already existed. One of the IPU's roles was to build linkages between women's caucuses, which it had effectively done between the parliaments of Rwanda and Burundi, as well as other parliaments.

The Representative from BAHRAIN indicated that in her country, women represented 19 per cent of the legislative assembly. They hoped to increase that number in the future. In reality, 20 per cent of women parliamentarians were designated by the kingdom's sovereign and four were elected. One of the parliamentary committees was chaired by a woman MP and another was the deputy chairperson of the finance committee. None of that work could have been done without the help of men. They worked as a team and had made significant advances.

Ms. R. KADAGA (Uganda), co-Chair, explained that the purpose of the plan of action was to assist parliaments in taking action towards achieving gender sensitivity. It is an important policy document and they wanted it to be a strong and effective tool for parliaments. It was an innovation and positioned the IPU ahead of many organizations. Moreover, the plan built on the findings of the survey on gender-sensitive parliaments and presented parliaments with a wide range of measures that could be implemented. The plan was not meant to be a directive; it was a guide.

She proposed that they adopt the Plan of Action for Gender-sensitive Parliaments.

The Plan of Action was adopted by acclamation.

The meeting rose at 10.15 a.m.

Enforcing the responsibility to protect: The role of parliament in safeguarding civilians' lives

Item 4(a) of the agenda

Panel discussion on the subject items chosen for debate by the First Standing Committee
on Peace and International Security during the 128th Assembly
(Quito, 22-27 March 2013)

Sitting of Tuesday 23 October

(Afternoon)

The meeting was called to order at 2.45 p.m. with Mr. S.H. Chowdhury (Bangladesh) in the Chair.

The CHAIR welcomed the participants and introduced the two co-Rapporteurs, Mr. Leonard Ramatlakane (South Africa) and Mr. Serge Janquin (France) and the expert panellists, Mr. Edward Luck, former UN Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect, and Ms. Tina Park (Canada), co-Founder and Executive Director of the Canadian Centre for R2P.

Mr. L. RAMATLAKANE (South Africa), co-Rapporteur, said that the topic was both topical and urgent. The concept of the responsibility to protect had been endorsed by 121 countries at the 2005 World Summit. If a State failed to protect its citizens and peaceful measures had proved unsuccessful, the international community had a responsibility to take appropriate measures, with military action being the last resort. Effective operationalization and enforcement of the concept had often fallen short of the resolution adopted at the World Summit, with governments often lacking in implementation. What was required was an enforcement mechanism or a similar tool to enable governments to act or decide what option to explore to enforce the responsibility to protect. Such a mechanism would be useful and prevent the occurrence of atrocities.

The report reflected Brazil's statement: "No issue can be more deserving of the attention of the Security Council than the need to protect civilians in situations of armed conflict". He therefore considered that responsibility to protect standards could provide civilians with effective protection in situations of armed conflict. South Africa supported the claim that the responsibility to protect was premised on foreign policy and was party to the African Peer Review Mechanism. Consensus had not been reached on responsibility to protect norms. Some claimed they could be easily misused. Others considered it was a tool that powerful States could use to justify intervention and interference in the internal affairs of other States.

The idea behind the concept was to provide humanitarian intervention in specific circumstances, not to create an alternative framework for human rights protection. There was, however, a need to enforce human rights standards beyond domestic jurisdictions, and greater emphasis should be placed on supporting national mechanisms for the promotion of human rights. The Charter of the United Nations established the Security Council as one of the main international bodies with primary responsibility for maintaining world peace and security. Former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan had been instrumental in developing the concept. Numerous UN resolutions had since been passed expressing support for the doctrine and the organization's willingness to authorize the deployment of peacekeepers and adopt resolutions sanctioning military intervention.

The IPU had adopted a resolution calling for the immediate cessation of violence and human rights violations and abuses in Syria and for support for the efforts of international and regional organizations to bring about a peaceful end to the crises. It had also urged the United Nations to redouble its efforts to help bring an end to armed violence in the country and to address the humanitarian crisis. Part of the fall-out of the turmoil in Libya and other countries had to do with the fact that, although 191 countries had endorsed the concept in 2005, many still had reservations about the responsibility to protect. That was partly due to their fears about potential abuse of the doctrine to further the strategic interests of other countries. One of the issues that must be considered was whether the responsibility to protect was being selectively invoked. While the majority of States agreed in principle with the doctrine, their support was qualified by strong fears of its abuse when strategic and economic interests were at stake. They questioned why the doctrine was so readily invoked in cases such as Côte d'Ivoire and Libya, but not in Palestine.

Efforts must be made to dispel that perceived bias in the application of the responsibility to protect, lest it rendered States unable to intervene effectively and decisively in cases where mass atrocities were perpetrated. Brazil had articulated an interesting position regarding enforcement of the concept: responsibility while protecting. Drawing on the lessons of the Libyan crisis, the United Nations should always base its action on the principle of not doing itself harm. He supported the Brazilian view and felt that the United Nations should only impose sanctions or use force where necessary to achieve its goal and thus limit economic and military damage. That would help address concerns about abuse of the concept. Priority should be given to the contribution of continental and regional bodies – the African Union (AU), the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) – to the responsibility to protect. Parliament's oversight role over the executive extended beyond the national realm, and included international involvement.

He invited the delegates to make comments and suggestions.

Mr. S. JANQUIN, (France), co-Rapporteur, recalled that after the Second World War and other conflicts, the United Nations had considered that something had to be done to avoid conflict and limit civilian casualties as far as possible, hence the emergence of the idea of the responsibility to protect. More recent sources included the international community's intervention in the Balkans and its shameful inaction during the genocide in Rwanda. The AU had made a special contribution: Article 4 of the draft resolution advanced the principle of the responsibility to intervene to protect populations in the cases of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. The origins of that concept were various. It had been adopted at the 2005 World Summit and raised in relation to the situation in Libya. He believed that the international community should have intervened earlier. Colonel Gaddafi had described his own people as rats, vermin that should be exterminated. Surely the world could not have remained indifferent to that kind of attitude. Had the mandate given by the Security Council been exceeded? That question was open to debate. Some African countries, as well as China and the Russian Federation, had criticized the actions taken. There was a need to clarify the concept of the responsibility to protect. A distinction must be made between responsibility to protect and regime change.

The State's responsibility to protect was founded on three pillars: the primary responsibility of the State; international assistance and capacity-building; and where necessary, timely and decisive response. Based on those factors, parliaments should decide how they could contribute to enforcing the responsibility to protect. What was the nature and degree of parliament's responsibility? Was it strict compliance with international obligations to combat the most serious human rights violations? Parliaments must take all the necessary legislative measures and bring them in line with the international standards governing the protection of civilians. They must also enact the necessary legislation to ensure that persons guilty of violations were held to account for their actions. Parliamentarians must ensure that orders given to the armed forces complied with international law. It was the IPU's responsibility to monitor those issues. Everything must be done to assist fragile States in fulfilling their obligations to their civilian populations. Humanitarian aid, development cooperation and assistance in strengthening the rule of law were crucial. Such assistance could also involve support for security forces. Governments must enable the United Nations to respond quickly to situations and support and contribute to the Peacebuilding Fund.

With respect to timely and decisive responses, it was essential that parliaments were fully informed about all situations where widespread human rights violations were occurring. The use of force must be a last resort. No discussion of the responsibility to protect could ignore the crisis in Syria. Given the gravity of the situation, parliaments had an obligation to prod their governments about the actions they proposed to take in order to find a solution. He added that the responsibility to protect must not be limited to prevention and intervention. The international community also had a responsibility to rebuild the country and ensure its stability. The case of Libya had illustrated the inadequacy of a strategy of acting on the responsibility to protect with undue consideration for the consequences of the use of force. The responsibility to protect was based on a fresh interpretation of international law. The international community must define the concept as precisely as possible to avoid it being hijacked for purposes other than protecting civilian populations. Brazil had proposed that the concept be elaborated upon – responsibility while protecting, or responsible protection. It was, nevertheless, important not to weaken the concept by piling on conditions for intervening when atrocious crimes were being committed.

The CHAIR thanked Mr. Janquin and invited Ms. Park to make her presentation.

Ms. T. PARK (Canada), Panellist, said that parliamentarians could play a crucial role in enforcing the responsibility to protect. She would be addressing the challenges faced by the responsibility to protect today and make some suggestions on how parliamentarians could help enforce it at the institutional and State levels. The responsibility to protect was a relatively fledgling principle in international relations and was both complex and evolving. It had been narrowed down at the 2005 Summit for the sake of political consensus. It had defined the how, when and under whose authority international intervention could occur. Subsequently, in 2009, the UN Secretary-General's report on the implementation of the responsibility to protect had introduced the three above-mentioned pillars and further developed the concept. It was an ongoing process that sought to lay concrete foundations of the emerging norm. More input from academia, think-tanks and national governments was needed.

In the context of the Arab Spring, many critics had raised concerns about the use of force and the difficulty of implementing the responsibility to protect. Although the relevant UN resolution had been directly linked to the responsibility to protect, western countries had been accused of intervening for strategic reasons. The possibility of selectively invoking the concept was a real problem concerning intervention. Parliaments should be more proactive about developing tools and mechanisms so as to ensure that humanitarian concerns took priority over national interests.

The use of force was the most contentious aspect of the responsibility to protect. It must be remembered that the use of force might prove critical in protecting civilian populations in compelling situations. The Rwandan genocide had been a clear example of a case where force was the only solution. The international community needed to favour prevention in order to stop mass atrocities at an early stage. The responsibility to protect was perceived as a political commitment to act upon shared moral beliefs; it was firmly rooted in international law and was an ally, not an enemy, of sovereignty. States had a responsibility to prevent and punish international crimes. The protection of civilians did not only encompass human rights law, but also humanitarian law, international criminal law and refugee law. While revolutionary, the responsibility to protect, as a concept, was not a new phenomenon and the international community must recognize its collective responsibilities.

She then made some concrete suggestions on how to make a difference in enforcing the responsibility to protect. First, national governments should consider establishing a focal point for responsibility to protect-related matters. They should appoint a senior government official to facilitate the creation of a national mechanism with an early warning system for mass atrocity prevention. At the national and regional levels, there were compelling reasons to identify risk scenarios. Regional stakeholders were very important in the implementation of the responsibility to protect. Currently, 17 countries had such focal points. She encouraged national governments to take part in that important initiative.

Knowledge of the responsibility to protect was important as the concept was still not properly understood. Education was needed for the concept to move beyond an academic debate. National parliaments should inform the public and fellow politicians. Parliamentarians should speak out when the responsibility to protect was being abused and hold governments to account. It should not become a partisan issue. The website r2plive.org contained information on all matters related to the concept and was available in all the official UN languages. Greater efforts must be made at the national and regional levels to ensure that there was a knowledge base for the responsibility to protect that was easily accessible to all involved. In addition, the responsibility to protect should be referenced in government policy and should involve a wide range of stakeholders, such as the media, non-State actors and the general public.

Mr. E. LUCK, Panellist, said that he was delighted to see that the IPU had taken up that subject. He had been pleasantly surprised to note the use of the strong word "enforcing" in the draft resolution. It should be recognized that the United Nations had invoked the responsibility to protect in a variety of situations. By and large, it had been invoked under Chapter VI on Pacific Settlement of Disputes or Chapter VIII on Regional Arrangements. Exceptions had been made on the rare occasions when the Security Council had taken the decision to act under the provisions of Chapter VII on Action With Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Acts of Aggression. No two situations were identical and different tools were needed for different circumstances. The UN Secretary-General had always called for an early and flexible response depending on the circumstances of each case.

In practice there was very little difference between prevention and response. In some ways, prevention could be regarded as a response to a given situation. There was thus a continuum between the two. A policy based only on prevention had little chance of success. Inversely, one based exclusively on enforcement, with no consideration for prevention, would also likely fail due to the absence of a knowledge base and the political will to support and sustain the effort. Parliaments could play a pivotal role in supporting and sustaining efforts to enforce the responsibility to protect.

The second pillar of the responsibility to protect – providing assistance to States – was the least understood. Parliaments could play an important role in holding foreign assistance programmes to scrutiny in a bid to ensure that they were designed in such a way as to reduce the likelihood of atrocities. In addition, parliament's oversight function of its government's international commitments was crucial. For example, at the 2005 Summit, the Head of States had agreed not to incite violence. It was judicious to insist that national armies observe international law. In many cases, such as in Syria, militias were used and sometimes committed the worst atrocities.

Parliaments could play a role in identifying when governments became selective in their interventions. It must be remembered that the UN Security Council was a political body that made political decisions. It examined situations on a case-by-case basis and took decisions accordingly. The UN Secretary-General did not have that luxury; he had to be consistent in the way the responsibility to protect was applied. Referring to the Brazilian proposal of responsibility while protecting, he explained that inaction was also an option that could sometimes prove as irresponsible as overreaction. Parliamentarians, like the public, had a fundamental obligation to hold governments to account. Parliaments served as the conduit between government and citizens. As an emerging and evolving concept, the responsibility to protect would require a great deal of care and nurturing. Most of all, it would require dialogue.

He concluded by saying that they all had a responsibility to try, not a responsibility to succeed. As the International Court of Justice had ruled in the case of Bosnia versus Serbia, the problem was that the government had not even tried to stop the unfolding atrocities which they had every reason to believe were about to take place. That in a nutshell was the individual responsibility to protect. Governments, parliaments and civil society were made up of individuals. Each of them had an individual responsibility to react and learn from past mistakes.

The CHAIR thanked Mr. Luck for his presentation.

Debate

Ms. S. MIRGALOY BAYAT (Islamic Republic of Iran) indicated that her country's position on the responsibility to protect was that it was the obligation and prerogative of a State to defend its population against war crimes, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity and genocide. Other States and the international community at large should only step in to help at the request of the country in question. The UN Charter was clear about the general prohibition of the use of force. The only exception was in cases of self-defence, threats to the peace, breaches of the peace or acts of aggression. The relevant sections of the Charter were sufficiently clear and should not be interpreted as endowing States with the right to intervene.

The responsibility to protect as a humanitarian concept should not be misused or abused so as to undermine the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-interference in the internal affairs of another State. Any attempt to justify an intervention under the pretext of humanitarian action would seriously undermine the well-established principles of international law and would pave the way for politically motivated interventions. Atrocities had gone unpunished not because of a lack of legal norms, but a lack of political will.

Iran had experienced the bitter consequences of UN inaction to stop aggression during the eight-year war waged under Saddam Hussein's regime. The key to preventing such crimes in the future would be to faithfully enforce the UN Charter and avoid selectivity and double standards, as well as accelerate the reform process in order to redress the deficiencies of the UN system and its inability to act when action was required. In the case of Libya, the Security Council had exceeded its mandate, which had raised several concerns. The vague notion of the responsibility to protect should be discussed at the UN General Assembly in a transparent manner in order to address all concerns.

Mr. A. MICHAELIDES (Cyprus) said that for almost two years the world had been witnessing unprecedented social uprisings in the Middle East and North Africa, commonly known as the Arab Spring. The situation in Syria had been steadily deteriorating with a staggering death toll. The violence had reached catastrophic proportions and people were suffering tremendously. He asked what they had done, individually and as an Assembly, since the responsibility to protect concept had been endorsed in 2005, to address the mass atrocities against civilians in that region. Their global community of parliaments should approach the responsibility to protect doctrine in a balanced and sensitive way, by supporting and highlighting the importance of protecting civilians during and after situations of armed conflict.

Parliaments should share the responsibility at the prevention stage by promoting observance of fundamental principles of international law and human rights. Should prevention not be possible, parliaments should ensure that all peaceful means were exhausted before any further action was taken. Cyprus had been suffering from the dire consequences of military invasion and continued occupation by Turkey of its northern region since 1974. Without UN endorsement, any intervention that violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a country, in the name of the responsibility to protect doctrine, was unacceptable. The parliaments of other countries should not be indifferent to cases of failure to protect populations. In fact, citizens were entitled to appeal for protection, where necessary. Parliaments should guarantee that right by urging their governments to establish early warning systems, which should be readily available to their population, including minorities and indigenous peoples. It was their duty, within the framework of the Standing Committee on Peace and International Security in particular, and the IPU in general, to address, through dialogue, their concerns regarding the responsibility to protect with a view to building a better future for all civilians.

Ms. M. VAN EETVELDE (Belgium) observed that given the difficulties encountered in implementing the responsibility to protect, the tendency had been to circumscribe the use of force by imposing additional conditions. It was entirely legitimate to worry about the negative repercussions of humanitarian intervention by military means, but if that attitude was taken to its extreme such intervention could be reduced to a purely theoretical option. No operation could be flawless in a situation where the worst kinds of atrocities were being committed. In addition to the objective of protecting the civilian population, there would always be other interests weighing on the decision to intervene by force. However, the need to protect civilians must always be the top priority. If caution did actually result in foregoing coercive action, that would be tantamount to States reneging on their commitment made at the 2005 Summit. They must adopt a critical approach to the arguments advanced by sceptics of the responsibility to protect concept. Regarding the argument that the purpose of intervention should never be to effect regime change, if a regime bore primary responsibility for crimes the intervention was intended to curb, removing the regime from power would likely be the only option available. The choice of new regime, however, must remain squarely in the hands of the people. The link between the responsibility to protect and regime change seemed to be the sticking point in the resolution. It was hoped that a consensus could be achieved.

The delegate of IRAQ indicated that parliaments played a key role in protecting human rights. Many human rights violations took place in countries that did not have elected parliaments representing the entire population. He observed that the report concentrated on gross violations. Yet those violations started off as little ones. The report failed to mention human rights violation by extremists and terrorist organizations and the role of the IPU in protecting human rights. The IPU should have a role to play in defending human rights and referring violations to its relevant committee. The Organization should benefit from reports issued by independent organizations that defended human rights.

The delegate of CUBA stated that the good intentions of those in favour of establishing the responsibility to protect as part of the international justice system were well-known. However, they should not ignore the risk of the concept being manipulated by the hidden agendas of those who sought to justify the use of force. History had been replete with examples of wars waged on the pretext of protecting civilians. Many key issues remained unanswered. For example, who decided and how if there was an urgent need to intervene under the responsibility to protect concept? Who determined that the time for peaceful methods was over? Did small States have the right to intervene in larger ones? Would some States allow interventions in their own territory? The concept was credible only if applied without any selectivity. That could not be guaranteed in the current world order. Cuba was and would be opposed to any intervention that was not sanctioned by the UN Charter.

Mr. M.A. BILTAJI (Jordan) remarked that Jordan was the smallest country in the Middle East with the least resources. It was home to streams of refugees. Major issues had been raised, such as the responsibility to prevent, the responsibility to react and the responsibility to rebuild. He would like to see a responsibility for occupation. Palestine had been occupied by Israel for over 60 years. Occupation was another form of oppression from which civilians needed protection. He suggested that an IPU taskforce be formed of representatives of five to seven countries that were not permanent members of the Security Council or incumbent members. That taskforce could be the conscience of the IPU. He feared that they might move from the "benefit of the doubt" to "the road to hell is paved with good intentions". He advised caution.

Mr. G. SCHNEEMAN (South Africa) said that it was the role of parliaments to make sure that the necessary legislation and mechanisms were in place to protect their own citizens. Parliaments must engage actively with the executive and hold it up to scrutiny. On the international front, South Africa's position had been to encourage countries to find solutions when possible. It did not subscribe to interfering in the affairs of other States or taking steps to effect regime change. South Africa did, however, support the doctrine of responsibility to protect in instances of gross human rights violations in line with the mandates of the major international organizations. South Africa was playing a leading role on the African continent as part of peace missions, all sanctioned by the AU. There was a need to balance respect for the sovereignty of States with action to curb gross human rights violations. The United Nations and other bodies, such as the AU, must take a firm stance. As parliamentarians they had to make sure that everything was done to protect civilian lives. The IPU should take a more active role and share best practices adopted by different countries.

The delegate of BAHRAIN said that it was essential to agree on a clear definition of the concept of the responsibility to protect. The principle of sovereignty must be respected while taking into consideration different cultures and regimes. The executive had the power and the prerogative to negotiate international treaties and agreements. Parliamentary diplomacy played a crucial role in the international arena. Parliaments should participate in the protection of civilians through mechanisms enshrined in the national constitution. They must communicate with governments in order to verify the official position vis-à-vis decisions of the UN Security Council and express its own. Parliamentary committees should be invested with the requisite powers to fulfil that role. Parliaments had to ensure that governments put in place early warning systems in order to guarantee a rapid response in case of internal conflicts. They must also promote the role of the media by protecting freedom of expression.

Mr. S. DANUSUBROTO (Indonesia) believed that further discussion of the concept of the responsibility to protect was unwarranted. It had been discussed and adopted by consensus at the 2005 World Summit. In cases where a State was manifestly failing in its responsibility to protect its population, the international community had a responsibility to assist States in fulfilling their national obligations. The responsibility to protect was a universal principle but its implementation should take into account institutional and cultural differences.

The responsibility to protect also encompassed efforts to strengthen the capacity of States to meet minimum criteria of good governance and application of the rule of law. That in turn would assist States in better protecting their populations. Any discussion on that issue should include a comprehensive and clear strategy aimed at strengthening capacity-building programmes. Prevention must necessarily include strengthening the early warning capacity of the United Nations by working closely with regional and sub-regional partners. The ASEAN Charter and Political-Security Community Blueprint contained elements of the responsibility to protect. Indonesia had helped shape that debate. In March 2012, Indonesia had hosted an International Workshop on the Role of the UN in Multidimensional Peacekeeping and Post-Conflict Peace Building. Indonesia believed that operationalization of the responsibility to protect should be placed in the context of its three pillars, relevant guidelines and the UN Charter. Parliaments could and should play a constructive role in strengthening the capacity of States to protect and promote human rights through legislation and monitoring.

Mr. S. AL SHAMMARI (Transitional Arab Parliament) begged to differ with the co-Rapporteurs and most of the presenters. They had spoken about the responsibility to protect as though it was a new principle. A decision had already been taken at the 2005 World Summit to commit the international community to protecting civilians. The purpose of their discussion was not to debate the issue but to help activate and galvanize the support of the international community in implementing the

responsibility to protect. The draft resolution stated that it was the responsibility of each Member to protect its population against genocide and other similar crimes. The international community could only intervene in one case: when a State was incapable of protecting its own population. It was for the Security Council to decide when to intervene. For example, the decision to intervene in Libya had saved thousands of lives. He encouraged the IPU to adopt a resolution to end the veto rights granted to China and the Russian Federation, which were hindering the international community's efforts.

Mr. D. KALAKANI (Afghanistan) noted that armed conflict always had terrible consequences on society. One such consequence was the loss of countless human lives. The role of parliament in safeguarding civilian lives during armed conflict was not always well-articulated. Because of external interference in Afghanistan, the country continued to be plagued by armed conflict. Most of the victims were civilians. It was their duty, as representatives of the people, to find solutions to end armed conflict and to ensure peace and stability. The Afghan Parliament was trying to find a peaceful solution to end the conflict with the Taliban and engage in a lasting peace process. The role of parliament was essentially to secure peace and prevent civilian casualties.

Mr. A. PONLABOOT (Thailand) said that States had a sovereign responsibility to protect. The responsibility to protect was not yet a legal norm in Thailand because the notion was indeterminate and did not meet the requirements of a legal norm. He believed that the concept needed further clarification, especially regarding the definition and scope of sovereignty. Thailand was determined to uphold the policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States. Thus, it felt strongly that no State should take unilateral action in the name of the responsibility to protect against any sovereign States that failed to protect their own citizens from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. He reiterated that only collective efforts carried out through UN mechanisms and action taken in accordance with the UN Charter were legitimate. In order to put the responsibility to protect concept into practice, further consultation among UN Member States were needed to draw up clear rules and procedures to ensure that it was applied in a consistent manner with preventive measures against unilateral intervention, and bearing in mind the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States. What would be the criteria for determining which situations required timely and decisive intervention by the international community? What procedure would be put in place to activate such interventions? As the responsibility to protect was linked to the UN Security Council, reform of that body was regarded, among other measures, as a means of ensuring effectiveness, accountability and transparency. That in turn would enable the UN Security Council to respond to the responsibility to protect concept with more credibility and justification.

Ms. S. FORTIN-DUPLESSIS (Canada) said that Canada supported the United Nations in its efforts to operationalize implementation of the responsibility to protect. It had participated in enforcing the UN-sanctioned no-fly zone over Libya and in the NATO military action to protect the Libyan population from crimes against humanity and war crimes. Canada had resolved to prevent and punish genocide, ethnic cleansing and war crimes, and it supported efforts to bring those responsible to justice. It had made democracy, human rights, the rule of law and good governance the main pillars of its foreign policy. It was essential to strengthen the capacity of States to practise good governance and build democratic institutions, with the goal of preventing mass atrocities. The responsibility to protect doctrine provided a framework for the use of tools such as mediation, early warning systems, training and diplomacy, regional peer review processes, and the powers granted under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Parliamentarians could play a leading role in protecting civilian populations. Through the IPU and other international forums, they could develop best practices to ensure that States had the means to protect their population and honour their responsibilities. They could also encourage and assist other States in fulfilling their responsibilities and supporting national measures to protect vulnerable populations, including women and children, from mass atrocities, and at the prevention stage. Canada had intervened to defend human rights in Iran following the imprisonment of persons without trial or charge. Parliamentarians had made an intervention in the Senate on that and many other cases. In all the forums in which Canada participated, it helped other countries protect their populations and assisted other parliamentarians.

Lord JUDD (United Kingdom) observed that there was widespread cynicism throughout the world about countless meetings and conferences which produced endless reports that failed to secure action. They lived in an interdependent world. As part of the process of governance, governments

participated in decisions that would affect the destiny of their people in the international context. That had started to undermine the principle of democracy. Systems must be put in place within parliaments to keep governments under constant check at the international level. Those arrangements should be sufficiently strong so as to wield influence before decisions were made rather than just tamely comment on them subsequently. He added that journalists were the lifeblood of any informed democracy; they were the key to protection. Protection of citizens must take into consideration the challenges of collateral damage. It was also important to strengthen the international rule of law, which must include examination of the sinister process of drones and extra-judicial killings in society. Whatever they chose to do would only be effective if they were consistent. Even great powers needed to be held to account.

The delegate of the NETHERLANDS concurred that States had a responsibility to protect their own people and that enforcement was needed. If that had already been the case, no enforcement measures would be needed and the entire concept of the responsibility to protect would not be controversial. Unfortunately, that was not always the case, and when States could protect their people, difficulties arose. In situations where the international community had to shoulder the responsibility to protect citizens from their own States, problems arose regarding intervention. It was clear that military intervention should be a last resort. A wide range of other measures must be available and exhausted before military intervention was even considered. Yet in practice that was quite difficult. There was a discrepancy between the responsibility to protect, which was a quasi-legal principle, and the decision of last resort – military intervention – which was a political decision with the Security Council. Examples of parliamentary experience and good practice were welcome. The decision to use military intervention should not be entirely out of the hands of parliaments.

Mr. S.P.S. BAJWA (India) recalled that the 2005 World Summit had affirmed the responsibility of each individual Member State to protect its population from the four identified crimes. The international community also had some responsibility in the matter to use diplomacy and other peaceful means. Parliamentarians had a crucial role to play in ensuring that States honoured their international obligations and responsibilities. The Indian Parliament had played a significant role in protecting the population in the face of possible threats. A number of legal instruments had been enacted to protect the vulnerable groups within society, such as those on the prohibition of child labour, the promotion of civil rights and the mental health act. Parliament had been exercising oversight on effective implementation of legislation. It was important to keep three fundamental points in mind, namely: the responsibility to protect could not be used to address all of society's ills; the response of the international community should not be coercive; and the concept must win over the respect of the international community. The responsibility to protect should start with early political engagement. Specific needs of the concerned State should be given due consideration. Sufficient time should be allowed to give the non-coercive measures a chance to achieve the desired results. Only when serious attempts at peaceful measures failed should coercive measures be contemplated. Such measures must be based on the concept of the responsibility to protect while protecting, as had been proposed by Brazil. All actions must be sanctioned by the United Nations and provide for accountability mechanisms.

Mr. J. ALMEIDA (Portugal) stated that the deteriorating situation in Syria had resulted in great loss of life and heightened tensions in the region. The consequences were unpredictable. It was obvious that Bashar Al-Assad was an obstacle to peace and must step down immediately. The Portuguese Government continued to believe that the democratic future of Syria required the tolerant and respectful participation of all political and religious factions. It would continue to work with its partners in the Security Council until a solution was found. The discussion on the role of parliament in the responsibility to protect touched upon a fundamental value, the protection of human rights, of which the most important was the right to life. Still, the sovereignty of each State could not be ignored. Parliaments had a decisive role to play because they represented the people. A true separation of powers between government and parliament was essential. It was the role of parliament to legislate to protect human rights and to establish harsh penalties for any breaches. Parliaments also had an oversight role and must ensure that their governments respected international law. They also ratified and transposed international agreements into national legislation. Moreover, parliament had specific powers in budgetary issues and played a role in the transition between regimes and in post-conflict reconstruction.

Mr. N. COLMENARES (Philippines) felt that the emphasis should be placed on the responsibility to prevent. If the world expressed greater concern over small violations, there would be no escalation. The responsibility to prevent was not that difficult to implement. The difficulty lay in the attitude of the international community not to intervene before a conflict escalated.

The delegate of BANGLADESH considered that the report had overlooked an important point: gender-based persecution. He asked what the international community had done for refugees. He concurred that parliament should play a role of prevention. But what if that failed? What should be done next? Should the international community contemplate military intervention? When civilians were victims and the government was not taking any action, the international community had a responsibility to react. The IPU should develop relevant guidelines.

Mr. Ø. VAKSDAL (Norway) observed that the responsibility to protect was an important concept and had become a tool with great potential to stop genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing. The challenge lay in putting it into practice. He concurred on the need for an enforcement mechanism to limit use to specific situations. The use of force in the form of military intervention always carried the risk of unintended casualties and instability. Such consequences were regrettable and had the potential to undermine the responsibility to protect as a political instrument. The co-Rapporteurs had cited the case of Libya and seemed to agree that it had been a case where western countries had gone beyond their mandate to achieve purely humanitarian objectives. A thorough assessment of the military intervention should be based on the responsibility to protect. The point of departure must be the amount of intelligence available when the decision to allow a military intervention was made. In the case of Libya, there was no doubt that Gaddafi's forces had been about to commit mass killings. Should the international community not have reacted to that imminent threat to civilian lives? He believed that the international community had been right to intervene but admitted that any military intervention would inevitably have unintended consequences. The past decade had shown that the international community had been too hesitant and too slow to intervene in crisis situations. That reluctance had hindered decisive action.

The delegate of JAPAN indicated that she wished to address a different issue, the importance of journalism. With regard to human rights violations, action must be taken. Inaction was a choice. The media were among the most important information tools. It was difficult for countries to act on events happening in other countries. A Japanese journalist had been killed in Syria. She had been targeted because she was a journalist and was able to disseminate information. Protecting journalists was another way of ensuring that information got out to the wider world.

The representative from CHINA indicated that the fundamental values of the UN Charter had not changed, nor had basic international norms and laws. The new concept of the responsibility to protect had to be considered in the context of the sacrosanct principle that each country had a responsibility to protect its own people. The concept could not be used as a pretext to change basic international norms. In all situations peaceful solutions should be sought and a case-by-case approach should be adopted. The role of parliament could not be overstated.

The delegate of PALESTINE said that when a country faced occupation, it was very difficult to enact legislation to protect and guarantee the safety of its own people. In his opinion, there were two ways to implement the responsibility to protect: from within States or failing that, from without: from the United Nations.

The representative from FRANCE suggested replacing the term "ethnic cleansing" with "ethnic elimination" since the former had been used by criminal leader. He felt that measures should be identified for parliaments to monitor and oversee armed intervention. Parliament had a vital role to play in situations where human rights violations were being committed. They must examine how the IPU and regional parliamentary organizations could help parliaments to be vigilant and prevent such violations, and how to better support parliamentarians who had the courage of their convictions to speak out against such vile acts.

The delegate of the UNITED ARAB EMIRATES noted that parliamentarians represented the interests of the people. As parliamentarians, they should pay tribute to the role of regional organizations. Parliamentarians must be the conscience of the people; they must stand for civilians. They did not have the requisite mechanisms to allow them to use their consultative and legislative powers for international responsibilities. The IPU must be able to come to the aid of Syria. They had to defend international laws that protected civilians but should not abandon international legitimacy. They must stand up against regimes that killed their own people.

The delegate of NIGERIA said that in many countries, civilians lived in an atmosphere of insecurity. It was the primary responsibility of governments to protect their population. That was only possible if certain laws were enacted. The rule of law governed the people. Parliaments should enact laws in conformity with international laws. Those laws should conform to human rights laws, refugee law, criminal law, etc. Parliaments should advise governments appropriately. The Constitution of Nigeria provided that every person had the right to life. Parliament should exercise diligent oversight and military intervention should be used as a last resort.

The representative from TUNISIA considered that protecting civilians was among the first tasks of parliament. Tunisia condemned any violations that threatened human rights anywhere in the world. It was necessary to provide the requisite framework and machinery to enable parliaments to protect civilians. That responsibility must be held at two levels. At the national level, parliaments should protest against any violations by government through its oversight powers. At the international level, parliaments should scrutinize whether interventions were carried out to protect human rights or for political or economic interests. A legal framework must be developed to guarantee human rights while respecting the sovereignty of States. Human rights must be respected in times of peace and war.

The representative from ETHIOPIA noted that there were many examples of when the international community had failed to intervene in the face of mass atrocities. Concerns had been expressed that the responsibility to protect concept had been abused. At the 2005 UN World Summit, it had been affirmed that all States had a responsibility to protect their population. The issue was how to implement the concept without ulterior motives. States must incorporate the principle into their legislation. The Ethiopian Government was doing its best to protect its civilian population and keep the peace. The government was keen to participate in regional organizations in order to promote peace.

Mr. M. MUTELO (Zambia) stated that Zambia was celebrating 48 years of independence. The State had managed to protect its population and was receiving refugees from neighbouring countries. Civilians were innocent and the international community must make greater efforts to protect them. The IPU should establish a mechanism for protecting populations and keeping the peace.

The CHAIR thanked all the participants for the comments, suggestions and presentations.

Mr. L. RAMATLAKANE (South Africa), co-Rapporteur, thanked all the speakers for their invaluable input to the discussion.

Mr. S. JANQUIN (France), co-Rapporteur, noted that there had been much discussion of legitimacy and the need for peace. If things were to change, parliamentarians would have to urge their governments to take up those issues at the UN Security Council. Parliamentarians were the representatives of the people. More must be done to ensure that their ability to respect the will of the people was enhanced.

Ms. T. PARK, Panellist, observed that the responsibility to protect had come a long way in its short existence. She encouraged all parliamentarians to get more involved in both the educational and advocacy aspects of the responsibility to protect. Canada was no longer playing a leadership role with respect to the responsibility to protect. Other countries must take the initiative to cite the responsibility to protect whenever possible. As had been mentioned by many delegates, prevention was the most important pillar of the concept. Regional organizations must work with national governments to deal with crises before they escalated.

Mr. E. LUCK, Panellist, observed that many delegates had spoken about the State's capacity and will to protect its population. The standard was very simple: if a State manifestly failed to protect its population, such cases warranted an international response. However, there was no judgement on the intent or capacity of the State. While they should be concerned about possible misuse of the responsibility to protect, there was actually very little evidence of abuse. In the aftermath of the intervention in Libya, many studies had shown that strikes had been carefully targeted, but unfortunately, there had been casualties. On the flip side of the same coin, many thousands of lives had been saved because of that intervention. A number of safeguards were built into the responsibility to protect. Not many countries rushed to help other populations; in reality they found every excuse not to. Their report stated that the same standards should apply to non-State actors since States were not the only ones to commit such crimes. Groups and organizations that committed those crimes ought to be held to the same standards in term of their treatment of civilians. The question of occupation had also been raised, and even if the issue had not been mentioned in the outcome document, it was understood that if a country occupied territories it had the same responsibilities in those territories. Many references had been made to populations and civilians. He believed that it was very important for States to use the word "populations". That terminology had posed problems in other countries, notably Côte d'Ivoire, where the question of who was considered a citizen had been raised in terms of repressing certain parts of the population. The use of the term "population" included everyone in the territory, whether legal or illegal, immigrants, refugees or others.

The CHAIR informed the delegates that all interventions would be taken into consideration. The co-Rapporteurs would endeavour to faithfully capture the spirit and essence of the discussions in the draft resolution, which would be finalized in Quito in 2013.

He thanked the co-Rapporteurs, the two experts and the delegates present for their contributions.

The sitting rose at 6.10 p.m.

Fair trade and innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable development

Item 4(b) of the agenda

Panel discussion on the subject items chosen for debate by the Second Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade during the 128th Assembly (Quito, 22-27 March 2013)

Sitting of Thursday 25 October

(Afternoon)

The meeting was called to order at 2.35 p.m. with Mr. S. Alhousseini (Saudi Arabia) in the Chair.

The CHAIR welcomed the delegates and introduced the two co-Rapporteurs, Mr. François-Xavier de Donnea (Belgium) and Mr. Ronald Chitotela (Zambia). He indicated that the primary objective of the panel discussion was to help delegates get a better understanding of the subject that the Second Standing Committee would be debating at the Assembly in Ecuador in 2013.

Mr. F.-X. de DONNEA (Belgium), co-Rapporteur, said that the themes covered in the report were very topical. Many countries would not achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015. The world was experiencing a global economic and financial crisis. It was important to identify the financial resources needed to achieve the MDGs and to resolve or mitigate the impact of climate change. As far back as 2002, the international community had recognized "the value of exploring innovative sources of finance provided that those sources do not unduly burden developing countries" The concept of innovative financing for development had been gaining global political support since 2002. In addition to government initiatives, a spontaneous private-sector movement had emerged. A growing number of major private foundations was contributing to existing funds or creating new ones. As a result, a new category, namely public-private partnerships, had emerged. Those new private funds had become drivers of further innovation. The GAVI Alliance now received funding from the International Finance Facility for Immunisation (IFFIm), which was expected to raise US\$ 4 billion by issuing bonds against long-term official development assistance (ODA) commitments from eight donor countries. That Fund also received contributions through mechanisms such as affinity credit cards that contributed a percentage of profits from certain types of transactions.

The financial crisis had also heightened interest in schemes involving a small levy on private or public purchases. For example, by 2009, the air ticket levy scheme launched in 2006 had been adopted by 13 countries. The use of guarantees and insurance to stimulate financing for development was also expanding. The creation of a world lottery had also been suggested. The Leading Group on Innovative Financing for Development had discussed a variety of possible options such as a contribution on airline tickets and a levy on certain types of financial transactions. That model of voluntary levy had already been applied by the Global Digital Solidarity Fund, to which private and government bodies contributed 1 per cent of the value of new information technology contracts. In light of the importance of committed private philanthropic funds, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) had recently launched a new initiative to include private foundations in international discussions on development. It was important not to leave private donors on the sidelines of public discussions. Unhealthy competition should not be encouraged. In 2009, private donations had amounted to between US\$ 5 billion and US\$ 8 billion or 4 to 7 per cent of ODA. It was important that donations from private foundations be integrated in the community's overall vision.

The creation of international tax-like arrangements – tax to pay for global public goods, which belonged to everyone – was more controversial and had fuelled a heated debate. According to the 2010 report of the Committee of Experts to the Taskforce on International Financial Transactions and Development, that new and specific tax concept was key to addressing the funding gap in a sustainable way. The Committee of Experts had concluded that the best solution would be to levy a global currency transaction tax (CTT) on all major currency markets at the point of global settlement. Eleven European Union (EU) Member States had accepted the principle of such a tax, the terms of which were still under

study. Ideally, such taxes required general application. The Committee of Experts estimated that total foreign exchange turnovers amounted to approximately US\$ 900 billion in 2009, and that a transaction tax of 0.005 per cent levied on the four major currencies – the US dollar, the Pound Sterling, the Euro and the Japanese Yen - would yield between US\$ 33 billion and US\$ 34 billion annually.

Official development assistance, private foundations or new taxes would not eradicate poverty if donors did not take a resolute stance against corruption by their own economic operators and corrupt administrations in recipient countries. There were corruptors at one end and the corrupted on the other. It was also necessary to enhance assistance to countries with weak legal systems. Large sums of money could be recovered. An estimated €800 billion was lost annually by developing countries through practices such as tax evasion, corruption and other illicit activities.

Climate change must also be taken into account. Some countries in the South were paying additional costs to deal with damage resulting from certain types of climate change. That would require additional financial efforts.

Mr. R. CHITOTELA (Zambia), co-Rapporteur, defined fair trade according to their findings: the organized positive social movement involving goods and services. It was aimed at helping producers in developing countries to create better conditions and promote sustainability. Why fair trade? For many conventional products, the price was unfair. Farmers and producers were having a hard time meeting their needs. The fair trade system was expected to change that because the commercial buyers were obliged to pay fair prices for bulk goods and the farmers received just payment for their produce. The Fair Trade movement with corresponding certification advocated payment of a higher price to exporters as well as higher social and environmental standards. Fair trade was about better prices for products, decent working conditions, local sustainability, and fair terms of trade for framers and workers in the developing world. By requiring companies to pay above the market price, fair trade addressed the injustices of conventional trade, which traditionally discriminated against the poorest and the weakest producers. That meant the price covered the production costs, along with a premium, that the organizations would be able to reinvest in either the business, society or the environment. Fair trade addressed the improvement of the quality of life through the organizations that supported small-scale producers.

Fair trade was a way of doing business that aimed to keep small farmers and producers as active participants of the world marketplace and to empower consumers to make purchases that supported their values. Fair trade was currently in place in 58 developing countries and had many benefits. Several independent studies had been undertaken to measure the impact of fair trade on disadvantaged farmers and workers. The report highlighted Daniel Jaffee's findings that fair trade provided for higher prices to farmers, which increased their household income. Participation in fair trade reduced household debt and enhanced people's economic options. Some of the long-term advantages to producers associated with fair trade included: higher and more stable income; investing in the fair-trade premium to strengthen business and social assets (health, educations and infrastructure); access to credit and pre-finance; long-term contracts and business relationships; improved terms and conditions for workers; greater empowerment; and enhanced environmental management. Fair trade also benefited consumers in other countries by educating them about the lives of the people who produced the goods, offering high-quality food products, sharing as much information as possible with consumers and inviting them to participate in political activities aimed at improving the lives of farmers.

Farmers who lived in conflict zones were exploited and among the poorest in the world. When buyers paid a fair premium, farmers were able to protect themselves and their families and strengthen their communities through nutrition, financing and more. It was imperative to have in place a support system. Given that fair trade was essentially voluntary, it was important for developed and developing countries to have coherent and sufficient support mechanisms for fair trade. Support should include the following measures: study on the impact of fair trade on poor producers; provision of information to consumers on fair trade products and support fair trade organizations; and implementation of agricultural subsidies as a way of strengthening a higher number of producers. Abnormally high subsidies granted by developed countries to their farmers tended to disadvantage unsubsidized produce from farmers in developing countries on international markets, as produce from developing countries tended to cost more. Products from anywhere around the world should be able to compete favourably and fairly. The co-Rapporteur concluded by saying that fair trade was not a complete solution, as it could not remove the majority of participants from a life of poverty. That was due to the fact that there

were insufficient numbers of fair trade companies to buy produce from all the farmers in the world. The entire system must change so that farmers could be paid a fair price for the food and other items they produced. Fair trade should be seen as a tool for tackling poverty among vulnerable groups and for promoting sustainable development in all developing countries.

Debate

Mr. K. SITTHEEAMORN (Thailand) admitted that the idea of free trade was not novel. In principle, if all nations reduced barriers to trade, the economy would grow faster and the purchasing power of consumers would increase. Yet the reality did not reflect their hopes and expectations. Although numerous bilateral and regional agreements had been put in place since the conclusion of the GATT Agreement and the creation of the WTO, many new forms of non-tariff measures were seen. When faced with global or regional economic crises, new forms of protectionist measures emerged. The original idea of free trade, which was supposed to be fair, had only been realized in part. It also created many new challenges. The farming sector sometimes represented a large proportion of the population in certain developing countries, which was more of a political than an economic issue. That was why subsidies had become so high in most developed countries. The persons most affected by subsidies were the poor in food-exporting countries. That practice was neither free nor fair. Their only hope was the successful conclusion of Doha Development Round at the WTO. Despite commitments by leaders of all major countries, they had not seen any progress to date. The status quo could not be allowed to continue. In order to achieve sustainable economic development, attention must be paid to the poor in society, especially farmers. Farmers had little or no access to commercial finance. It was time to focus more on fair trade than free trade. Successful microcredit projects in various countries provided useful lessons.

Ms. A. KYRIAKIDOU (Cyprus) noted that fair trade was a sine qua non condition to narrow disparities between developed and developing countries. Producers should be equal, irrespective of their financial situation and power, and have equal access to the world market. Fair trade could be beneficial both to producers and consumers. By earning higher profits and income, producers could achieve a better quality of life. Consumers could benefit from fair trade by being able to buy quality products and receive better information on producers and production conditions. As long as fair trade schemes remained voluntary, countries could choose whether to be part of them or not. Subsidies must be attributed appropriately, with the aim of meeting and complementing the needs of each country. The importance of green technology investments should not be forgotten. Those were essential to the healthy advancement of developing countries and, ultimately, to the fulfillment of the Copenhagen Accord commitments. Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) were an important part of the Cyprus economy since they held most of the market share. Governments must prioritize the enhancement of SMEs through various initiatives. Although the global crisis had dealt a severe blow to governments' ability of to honour their ODA contributions, they must devise effective ways to further enhance the vital issue of fair trade. Fair trade was a real solution to many of the problems experienced by the developing countries and the world in general.

Mr. M. NAZZAL (Jordan) observed that Jordan upheld the free trade principles of sustainability, transparency and education and subscribed to free trade agreements. It was vital to review those terms to protect the planet for future generations. They should look more seriously at fossil fuel consumption, which might have to be subjected to an international tax. The arms industry and the cost of wars also warranted greater attention. The world still experienced avoidable famine and disease. How did energy costs reflect on fair trade? How could fair trade principles be unified when the global economy was not uniform? He expressed the hope that more in-depth global discussions would be held to achieve genuine fair trade.

Mr. S. TANIGAWA (Japan) said that in order to promote sustainable development, three conditions must be met. First, there must be increased support for fair trade producers. In 2012, there were 1.1 million fair trade producers in the world, an increase of 18 per cent due mainly to luxury products such as coffee, sugar and cocoa exported from small-scale producers. Enlisting the support of those small-scale fair trade producers was thus critical. Second, fair trade and community revitalization should be promoted hand in hand. A town in Japan had been given fair trade certification – which was possible for any town where local government, companies and people worked together to promote fair

trade products. Third, carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions should be taxed. Addressing global warming was an important and immediate challenge. Japan aimed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80 per cent by 2050. A green tax was already levied on fossil fuels. That would help to heighten awareness and change behaviour. Yet to be effective, that kind of tax on CO₂ emissions should not be limited to one country alone; it must be adopted by several countries. Collaboration between parliaments was essential in all of those areas.

Mr. R. LAABIDI (Morocco) stated the world had never known a production level that could adequately meet its needs. Multinationals had imposed a business model based on cutting costs, adapted products and quality while maintaining the margins needed to serve the major world markets. No one could deny the impact of that economic philosophy on various economies. That was globalization and it led to undesirable social effects for those parts of the world that did not have critical energy resources, that had not mastered cutting-edge technologies and that depended on favourable climatic conditions. Those countries were not able to take part in the new dynamic, which relied heavily on significant resources which they did not have. They were being forced into poverty or isolation. The future looked bleak. In order to overcome successive economic and financial crises, the free market must help populations through various means, including taxation and voluntary participation in subsidies. He made four recommendations: impose a global tax on polluting industries; review agreements and treaties pertaining to the development of underground and natural resources; restrict exports to developing countries through quotas to ensure that the stock of locally-produced goods was sold first; and give subsidies to countries that made an effort to prevent serious diseases, extremism, instability and illiteracy. He spoke about a development project in Morocco launched by King Mohammed VI, with a budget of US\$ 1 billion over five years. The activities undertaken would help the poor, individuals in precarious situations and the marginalized. The funds would be used to support income-generating and capacity-development activities, as well as initiatives to improve access to basic infrastructures and services. Such initiatives fostered human development.

Mr. A. MOCANU (Romania) commented that there were three years left to achieve the MDGs. It was quite obvious that those goals would not be achieved without the sustained mobilization of new national and international financial resources. The recession had exacerbated poverty everywhere and there were limited options for action. Changes in innovative funding had become a necessity. He made two suggestions: establish an EU platform for external cooperation and development; and levy a financial transaction tax. Romania had been an observer in the Leading Group on Innovative Financing for Development since 2009. As a complement to traditional international aid, innovative funding had been effective in fighting poverty and disease around the world. Moreover, it was stable and predictable. Innovative funding had contributed significantly to achieving the MDGs. If used strategically, it could have a multiplier effect. In order to be effective, innovative funding must be tailored to the priorities and specific circumstances of each country. A system of public accountability and periodic parliamentary review must be implemented to ensure the responsible and transparent use of that mechanism.

Ms. P. CARDOSO (Portugal) said that Europe faced many challenges and must create new and more efficient cooperation between countries. It was important to try and find ways to get financing to developing countries. Countries shared common markets and wanted to balance their product sales in the region where they were located. Policies often led to a waste of resources. Produce was thrown away because of excess production. Resources needed to be distributed to those who needed them most. Policies that prevented people from throwing away resources that so many others needed must be promoted.

The CHAIR gave the floor to the rapporteurs to respond to some of the issues raised.

Mr. R. CHITOTELA (Zambia), co-Rapporteur, concurred with the statements made by the delegates of Thailand, Cyprus, Morocco and Romania. All presentations would be taken into consideration in the draft resolution.

Mr. F.-X. de DONNEA (Belgium), co-Rapporteur, said that he agreed with much of what had been said, but wanted to comment on two of the points made, beginning with Japan's statement on a carbon emissions tax. In November 2010, the UN Secretary-General's High-Level Advisory Group on Climate Change Financing had examined a number of taxes and measures. The Group had concluded that the auction of emission allowances and new carbon taxes in developed countries were the best potential sources of revenue. The Moroccan delegate had said that it would be a good idea to review the arrangements for the development of underground resources. Those agreements were often quite unfavourable and resulted in a significant loss of resources for the countries involved. Therefore, they should be reviewed to ensure a more favourable exchange for the countries that owned the resources. It was for the parliaments concerned to occasionally review such agreements.

Mr. J.-L. DESTANS (France) said that there had been a substantial increase in fair trade globally despite the economic crisis. In France, fair trade sales had been estimated at just over €350 million in 2010, compared with only €63 million in 2003. Fair trade reflected the priorities set by international organizations in terms of human rights, labour laws and compliance with environmental requirements, especially in agriculture. There were two critical elements: international labelling of fair trade goods, which must be included in the negotiations; and the expansion of funding mechanisms. Clearly, ODA was in a state of stagnation. A number of suggestions had been made in the report. Private financing must be used more often. France was in favour of a currency transaction tax and believed it should be adopted on a broader scale.

Ms. B. Contini (Italy), First Vice-President of the Committee, replaced Mr. S. Alhusseini (Saudi Arabia) in the Chair.

Mr. G. GUNDERSEN (Norway) reminded the delegates that new taxes were not a free good to grab. Someone had to pay them. Finding new ways to promote economic growth in developing countries was important. Experience had taught that the traditional way to finance development aid was not efficient in terms of creating healthy economic growth as the money often ended up in the pockets of corrupt officials. The sectors where funds were most needed were not always targeted. Development aid may have a role to play in certain areas and situations. Western countries needed to move away from the concept of donor countries and pay more attention to investment and trade. Developing countries did not want to be aid dependent, they wanted to develop their economies. Trade between poor and rich countries was not without complications. Poor farmers were very vulnerable to trade barriers and subsidies. They also often worked under difficult conditions with low salaries and limited opportunities. Those issues needed to be addressed. They all agreed that trade should be fair. There was some merit to sensitizing consumers to the products they bought. Would having a premium in addition to the market value actually work? One had to tread very carefully with the price mechanism. The economic incentives might get mixed up. How could one make sure that the premiums helped the poorest and did not end up in the pocket of intermediaries? What was the definition of a poor or weak producer? It was an open invitation to corruption. He agreed with the goals but had serious doubts about the means. Most buyers would base their decisions on price. Developed countries also had a role to play by reducing trade barriers and subsidies.

Mr. E. ABENG (Indonesia) explained that with the ongoing uncertainty in the euro zone economy and a hesitant global economy, it had become apparent that the drivers of global economic growth were to be increasingly found in the growing markets of the South. A recent World Bank report had found that by 2025, the six emerging markets of Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, and the Russian Federation would collectively account for more than half of global growth. Increased trade, economic integration, removal of barriers to the movement of goods, services, capital and people were the major enablers of growth and job creation in most countries. As a member of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), Indonesia was working towards an integrated, paperless trade system to facilitate the exchange of goods across borders. ASEAN hoped to have such initiatives with other non-member countries. Parliamentarians must be able to oversee policies that affected businesses in order for countries to reap the benefits of growing markets in the rest of the world. Indonesia supported the outcome document of the Rio+20 Summit. It was important to enhance financial support from all sources in order to ensure sustainable development for all countries. Innovate financing mechanisms could make a positive contribution. The Government of Indonesia had committed to reduce its carbon emissions while stimulating economic development. Its target was to achieve 7 per cent economic

growth with a minimum of 26 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. That target would rise to 41 per cent reduction in emissions if international support was available. The parliament had passed several laws to support sustainable development, financing and the State treasury.

Mr. HE KENG (China) noted that many delegates considered protectionism to be the main obstacle to fair trade. China believed that the absence of financing was one of the problems facing development globally, particularly for low-income countries. Developed countries must ensure that the Monterrey Consensus was honoured and should honour their ODA commitments as well as cancel developing countries' debt. A global partnership was needed based on mutual benefit. Innovative financing provided a new approach. China was prepared to join the debates on all those matters, but wished stress the following principles: ODA was the prime source of funding for developing countries; therefore innovating financing must be an additional source rather than a substitute for ODA; innovating financing mechanisms must be based on a voluntary approach and must recognize national priorities and policies of the country benefiting from the funding; and there must be a clearly defined link between innovative funding and ODA in order to avoid any overlap. The procedures used in innovative financing must be simplified so as not to become an additional burden. Sustainable development was linked to long-term goals of all countries. The Rio+20 Conference held in June 2012 had sent a positive message to the world about the impact of international cooperation on world growth. The Conference also gave new impetus to sustainable development. The outcome document was an indication of the collective will to overcome differences. He considered the Rio+20 report to be exhaustive and balanced; it was a roadmap for the future. China intended to work with all parties to implement the results of Rio+20 and contribute to sustainable development. China was a developing country; it was facing environmental problems as well as the challenges of sustainable development. Over the next five years, China would be working towards green development, reducing its carbon footprint and ensuring that its production and consumption patterns were environment-friendly.

Mr. R. NOWROUZI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the developed countries had imposed several restrictions in their trade with developing nations on the pretext of respecting environmental standards. Unilateral sanctions had been imposed on Iran, for example on medication to treat cancer and kidney problems. Sanctions had been imposed on civilian airplanes and on nuclear material for peaceful agricultural use by countries who considered themselves to be the defenders of democracy and human rights. Developing countries needed to have access to financial resources to maintain their economic growth in order to meet the new economic and trade challenges. Environmental issues should be considered in decision-making processes at the national and global levels. Parliamentarians should pass appropriate laws to facilitate trade relations and boost economic and technological growth.

Mr. M. AMWEELO (Namibia) commented that the final declaration of the MDG Review Summit had made reference to an unequivocal role of innovative financing in the attainment of those goals. Currently, the likelihood of achieving the MDGs by 2015 was low. About 1 billion people in the world still did not have access to drinking water and a billion more suffered from hunger. Nearly one million people died each year of malaria, 1.3 million of tuberculosis and 2 million of AIDS. Poverty kept millions of children from school and prevented them from realizing their potential. The economic crises and climate change undermined governments' ability to meet their commitments. Development assistance was crucial to developing economies. However, it was important not to rely on foreign aid for the provision of basic needs. Developing countries wanted a fair system that allowed them to trade with developed nations so as to boost their economic growth and meet their development goals. Yet in reality, the developed countries protected their markets through various measures. An end must be put to unfair practices and double standards. All must be done to ensure that trading rules were beneficial to all States. He called on the developed nations to open up their markets to African exports and to remove subsidies that disadvantaged developing nations' produce. They were merely asking for a level playing field.

Mr. J.-K. LEE (Republic of Korea) stated that fair trade accounted for 0.1 per cent of the world's total trade. A one per cent rise in the share of profits from developing countries could lift 128 million people out of extreme poverty. The economies of most developing nations depended on agriculture and assistance. They had low incomes, high illiteracy rates and weak infrastructure. Under those circumstances, developing countries should have better access to green technologies, not only for purely technical reasons. The Republic of Korea had been placing green ODA high on its list of priorities.

The Government was planning to increase its share of green ODA by 30 per cent by 2020. It had imposed a tax on transportation and energy. Innovative funding mechanisms should help them progress towards global prosperity.

Mr. S. ALHUSSEINI (Saudi Arabia) resumed the Chair.

Mr. R. PEZ FERRO (Cuba) said that, for decades, there were no mechanisms to regulate the market and there was total privatization. Consequently, the State had withdrawn from the economic sphere. Today, there was a deep-seated economic crisis. That was the result of an economic and political concept that had been imposed on the world: neo-liberalism. Neo-liberal policy was followed by certain developed countries and inflicted on developing ones, which were the main victims of this crisis. The major powers claimed that it was cyclical and natural. Because of neo-liberalism, the global economy had not grown. Instead, instability and speculation had run rife. A huge gap had developed between the opulent North and the impoverished South. The economic crisis also had a negative impact on the struggle for sustainable development and environmental protection. Things must change. It was essential for the international financial system to be reformed. There should not be deregulation as that was anti-democratic. The basic nature of the system had not changed. A healthy balance must be sought; a compromise solution. It was necessary to adopt measures to help the exports of developing countries. Barriers to trade should be lowered. In no way should financing mechanisms affect States' ODA commitments. Countries in the South must promote and strengthen integration and subregional development on the basis of reciprocal trade.

Lord DAVIES of STAMFORD (United Kingdom) observed that fair trade was an enormous success but there must also be a robust system of credible validation. He expressed concern about the position of small producers in developing countries who wished to join the fair trade arrangements. They sometimes found themselves excluded by others already in the system. They must be clear about the rules and have reasonable assurances that assistance was available. Otherwise, they would be creating cartels in the producing countries. They also needed to be very clear about the fact that higher prices meant a higher margin for producers. Moreover, greater transparency was required. There had been talk about a financial transaction tax and about using the proceeds from emissions trading taxes to the benefit of developing countries. The EU already had an emissions trade policy but there were no discussions about using the proceeds for development. The option remained theoretically possible. It was crucial to ascertain who would be responsible for allocating and managing these proceeds and who would be responsible for monitoring spending. In addition, clear management structures were needed as well as clearly defined principles for distributing that money. Would it be distributed to governments, to the United Nations or another body? He suggested looking at remittances, on which banks made large margins, the flow of funds, private sector development, domestic credit creation and property rights.

Mr. M. BEG (India) said that financing for development remained a challenge. It was imperative to further streamline and reinforce development NGOs and explore opportunities for new and predictable financing for sustainable development. The WTO strove to promote and facilitate free and fair international trade. There had been little progress in the WTO negotiations in the past decade. Some of the developed countries had been reluctant to honour their commitments. Free and fair trade could help to effectively attain the goals of sustainable development. Some developed countries had been resorting to non-tariff barriers and protectionism to restrict market access. India was for an open, rule-based, predictable and non-discriminatory multilateral trading system. Sustainable development demanded sustainable financing. The ongoing financial crisis had adversely affected development funding and it was imperative for the international community to ensure that the financial flow remained fully compatible with development targets. India had been striving to mobilize resources through various innovative measures. Its infrastructure needs were high and in order to support those needs, the country had put in place a variety of schemes.

Mr. J.R. TAU (South Africa) indicated that parliamentarians would need to be involved in the implementation of the principles presented today. Parliamentarians passed legislation but were they effectively overseeing their governments' commitments in terms of fair trade? Subsidies and tariff barriers had a significant impact on farmers. What was the IPU's position on that matter? As parliamentarians, they must appeal to their own national parliaments to examine the mechanisms that

were put in place to the disadvantage of developing countries. How could they advance the cause of fair trade? It was important to put an end to the economic blockade against Cuba; it was affecting the country's development and access to fair trade.

Ms. F. AZIZ (Afghanistan) said that globalization created hope for greater integration and access to markets but it also presented a variety of challenges. The process of achieving fair trade and innovative financing had been promoted by the United Nations and was supported by many organizations. They focused on economic growth and support for emerging economies. States were increasingly called upon to adopt economic models for a greater freedom of trade and access to resources. The challenge for the developing countries had been how to balance the demands of the multilateral institutions with national aspirations and to protect young and emerging domestic markets. In an effort to gain greater access to different markets, Afghanistan had signed various agreements and regional trade arrangements and had opened up to international financing. It realized the need to balance the sources of international financing and the production of its natural resources while lending support to its local industries. Parliament had passed key legislation to guarantee fairness in domestic trade. The country realized that it could not live in isolation and must integrate into the world economy. Afghanistan continued to place economic transformation high on its agenda.

Mr. B. GIZAW (Ethiopia) said that the Ethiopian Government had recognized fair trade as an engine of economic growth and sustainable development. It had put in place a transformation plan for the next five years. In order to achieve fair trade, the government had taken certain measures, including consumer protection programmes and business licensing. The goal was to protect the business community from anti-competitive and unfair market practices and consumers from misleading market conduct and to establish a system that was conducive to the promotion of a competitive market. The government also wanted to promote free market economic development. In order to modernize the agricultural sector, a register was created to develop trade in main export commodities. To expand the foreign market for agricultural products, exporters had organized themselves into a group similar to the Coffee Exporters' Association. That association organized exhibits and conferences and participated in international trade fairs. Those activities had helped identify obstacles in the market and necessary measures to remove them.

Mr. P. SECKER (Australia) indicated that he had some problems with the concept of fair trade. It was not free trade, which he believed contained the real answers. Innovative financing for sustainable development should also support sustainable credit. There was not much point in lending money if you were not going to be paid back. Countries and companies must adhere to the laws against child labour and forced labour. They must also combat corruption and bribery, which could distort markets. He disagreed with the proposal to impose a global tax and regulate markets. If global taxes were voluntary, most countries that competed in the global market would not volunteer because it would put them at a disadvantage; it would make them uncompetitive. On the question of setting prices, he was equally sceptical. If the price was too high, people would not buy the product. The answer was not to try to regulate the market or impose a global tax, because that would increase the cost of food. He believed that it was more important to get rid of subsidies and non-tariff barriers: that would result in real free and fair trade.

Mr. M. MUTELO (Zambia) began by asking if fair trade could ever exist between the developed and developing countries. The literacy rates in the developing countries must first be improved. Small producers needed to gain greater independence and the rich countries had all the means at their disposal. The least developed countries needed modern technology to facilitate fair trade. One group was favoured over another. It was difficult for countries with high illiteracy rates to compete against wealthy countries and to really achieve fair trade under such conditions.

Ms. M. GREEN (Sweden) wished to share some of the benefits of fair trade. Parliament had a role to play in the creation of wealth but it was important to find the right mechanisms instead of creating dependency on aid. All countries should aim for equal trade. From a gender perspective, that is an important issue. Women often shared the financial responsibility for families and society but often received low pay or none at all for their labour. It was important for politicians to increase consumers' and companies' knowledge of social and environmental responsibility. Companies must act in a fair and transparent manner and should bear the environmental and social cost of their production. Regulations

could help foster responsible corporate behaviour. Companies must inform consumers of how their goods were produced. Politicians had a major role to play by proposing different ideas on how to promote fair trade and support the debate in their own countries. Workers should receive decent salaries and in conditions that respected international labour laws. Some municipalities in Sweden were working on acquiring fair trade certification through ethical public procurement. The local and national should set clear goals and targets regarding public procurement. All goods and services must be based on fair trade. It was a lofty ambition that must be taken step by step, setting ever higher targets every year. It could take 10 years for the entire world to be fair. That was what sustainable development was about: keeping communities strong today and for generations to come.

Mr. J.-C. MOKENI ATANINGAMU (Democratic Republic of the Congo – DR Congo) said that the discussion was even more compelling for a country such as his, a post-conflict country that had been torn apart by conflict because of its natural resources. With regard to fair trade, countries must, through their parliaments, be allowed to implement regulations to ensure that private companies got a certain return on their investments. Even if funding mechanisms were defined, fair trade would not be possible if countries – especially those in Africa – did not implement legislative measures to ensure that private companies were guaranteed a return on their investment. DR Congo was being torn apart: the demand from international companies for mineral and metals was fuelling one of the most violent and insurmountable conflicts in the world. A Global Witness report had shed light on how armed groups were hijacking the minerals trade in eastern Congo, while subjecting the civilian population to massacres, rape, extortion, forced labour, the forced recruitment of child soldiers, illegal taxation and blood minerals laundered by exporters, not the producers. The warring parties were funded through the control they exercised over most of the region's mineral resources (tantalum, tungsten, gold, etc.) Known conflict or blood minerals were illegally introduced into world supply chains, laundered by exporters (not the producers) and subsequently transformed into refined metals by major international foundries. Those metals were then used to manufacture a wide range of products, including electronic components. Some of the world's most famous brands were now facing growing pressure to reconsider the role they played in that devastating trade. No one was forced to buy minerals or metals mined in war zones. Companies that used minerals from eastern Congo must prove to the public that they had implemented measures to ensure that they were not directly or indirectly contributing to human rights violations through their purchases. This was known as demonstrating due diligence and engaging in fair trade. Although companies using those minerals faced mounting pressure to demonstrate such diligence, only a few were truly committed. Some companies argued that the process was too complicated and difficult. Those measures were regularly used by companies that had a good standing, to prevent corruption and environmental damage. Companies that used minerals mined in DR Congo should have adopted those measures long ago. Due diligence essentially consisted of five elements: implementing a conflict-minerals policy; identifying and assessing supply chain risks; adopting remedial measures to respond to identified problems; submitting the company's due diligence to independent audits; and disclosing the information to the public. Action must be taken against companies that contributed to the instability in the world's poor regions and hindered those areas from achieving the MDGs and ensuring the well-being of their population.

Mr. K. PUTTERS (Netherlands) said that coming from a country located largely below sea-level, it was understandable that the Dutch valued free and fair trade as much as sustainable development. The Netherlands was committed to the WTO negotiations and supported the fair trade focus. It also supported the definition of fair trade provided in the draft resolution. Developing countries deserved equal access to markets. Fair trade also meant good working conditions and fulfilling international climate change agreements when producing goods and services. New protectionist regulations should be opposed everywhere and profits from higher margins should not be flowing to intermediaries. Currently, the Dutch Government was re-thinking its policies on international trade and international aid. The EU had to sustain its efforts for free and fair trade and link them firmly to its policies on innovation, sharing knowledge and promoting sustainable development. New and different ways of financing must be found. Moreover, partnerships were needed. Some developing countries would suffer more from climate change and protectionism than most of the developed ones. Countries could learn from each other, share knowledge and stimulate new domestic policies. Regarding international taxation, he did not think it was the solution to free and fair trade.

Mr. D. ADAMS (Australia) said that based on their discussion there was general support for new ways of financing sustainable development and processing fair trade. Transparency in the supply chain had also been raised. It was crucial to bring developing countries into supply chains and give them access to new technologies, better opportunities and greater skills. The governance issues were also very important. Audits must become part of the process, ensuring that outcomes matched goals. He expressed concerns over airline ticket taxes: Australia was far away and it was already very expensive to travel. Work safety and work conditions were important: workers should always have the right to organize. As for open markets, Australia shared the concerns about market distortion. Target policies should provide countries with the appropriate tools to address their concerns. As for climate change, it was important to assist vulnerable developing countries.

The CHAIR observed that fair trade was a very important aspect of stability and peace in the world. The uprisings in the Middle East and North Africa bore some similarities to the situation in Eastern Europe before the transformation in the 1990s in terms of their relationship to fair trade. Some of those Arab Spring countries were not part of the WTO. He felt that all countries in the region should be part of the trading system in order to contribute to and benefit from trade and thus expand their economies.

Mr. F.-X. de DONNEA (Belgium), co-Rapporteur, thanked the delegates for their insightful remarks and responded to a few specific comments. He agreed with the Chinese delegate's comment that innovative financing could not be a substitute for ODA and that such assistance must be allocated in the recipient countries with their consent. Moreover, they must be involved in the projects funded with those funds. In addition, there must be coherence between the policies implemented by private funds, by new financing mechanisms and by ODA. He then commented on Lord Davis' presentation on new financing mechanisms, raising the fundamental question of who was going to allocate the proceeds. In his view, each country that raised new resources had to allocate them with the agreement of the beneficiaries. Lord Davies had made a good point about remittances, which he would include in the report. He commended the delegate of the Democratic Republic of the Congo for his excellent presentation of the appalling climate of corruption in the country. Some of the country's resources were stolen; if those resources made it into official channels, it would need very little outside assistance. Many countries and economic operators from the North were failing in their duties. States must have the courage to be very strict in enforcing their laws. There were tracking systems for diamonds; those should also apply to mineral resources. It was true that the IPU should help parliaments fight for fair trade. He agreed with the Australian delegate that a voluntary tax on financial transactions might divert the flow. Eleven European countries were willing to run that risk. Time would tell if that caused a financial flow diversion. Why was it more acceptable to tax bread than the financial flow? There might be negative effects. Perhaps they could debate the question further in Quito.

Mr. R. CHITOTELA (Zambia), co-Rapporteur, said that it was not possible to respond to all concerns and comments but they would try to come up with a document that was acceptable to as many delegations as possible. There was a difference between free and fair trade. Developing countries were not asking for hand-outs; they were asking for fairness, based on the quality of the product, not based on subsidies.

The CHAIR thanked all participants.

The sitting rose at 5.30 p.m.

The use of media, including social media, to enhance citizen engagement and democracy

Item 4(c) of the agenda

Panel discussion on the subject items chosen for debate by the Third Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights during the 128th Assembly (Quito, 22-27 March 2013)

Sitting of Monday 22 October

(Morning)

The meeting was called to order at 9.05 a.m. with Mr. O. Kyei-Mensah-Bonsu (Ghana), in the Chair.

The CHAIR explained that the resolution would be based on the report, which they would be discussing. It would subsequently be adopted by the 128th Assembly in Quito. He explained how the meeting would proceed and encouraged delegates to make proposals to enrich the draft report. He introduced the co-Rapporteurs and asked them to present their draft report.

Ms. M.T. KUBAYI (South Africa), co-Rapporteur, explained the purpose of the report. In a participatory democracy the public was actively involved in political processes. Democracies must provide the means to permit citizens' to have ongoing engagement in the policy-making process.

The fast development of communication technologies had influenced the way parliaments did business, particularly in developed countries. However, due to the high cost of technology, developing countries did not have easy access to many new technologies or they were reserved for small elite.

Traditional media – newspapers and radio – were still the preferred means of communication in developing countries. Radio was the main means of communication in many parts of the world and many parliaments were effectively using it, particularly in Africa, the Pacific Islands and parts of central Asia. Radio was often the only means of communications for people living in rural areas. Traditional media could play a positive role in political systems if there was a favourable environment.

Mechanisms such as codes of ethic and professional standards must be put in place to hold the media and journalists to account to the public. An independent media was essential and could be guaranteed if media organizations were financially viable, free from intervention and operated in a competitive environment. Ideally, the media should be accessible to as many people as possible.

In many instances, the media had been accused of sensationalism because of the type of stories it covered and the way the information was presented. That notwithstanding, the media could play a dual role: a watchdog and a relay between parliament and citizens.

In recent years, the use of social media had increased in Africa due to improvement in infrastructure, the advent of wireless technologies and low rates.

For example, Facebook had been widely adopted as a communication tool across the African continent, with approximately 40 million users as at March 2012. That number was low compared with Europe (more than 200 million users) and Asia (with more than 100 million users).

The wealthy enjoyed access to the networks and had the skills to use them. Only one in 10 Africans had Internet access. That low number could be attributed to poor computer skills and the costs associated with Internet use. Social media platforms were not regulated by any code of ethics. That made it difficult to prosecute individuals for defamation as comments were often posted under a false identity.

Ms. C. CHARLTON (Canada), co-Rapporteur, admitted that in preparing the report, she had realized that countries had different experiences with social media. The media environment was changing rapidly and more and more people were using social media. However, the impact of social media on their lives was not yet clear. Some said it led to more openness while others claimed that exchanges were often acrimonious. While it was a tool to exchange ideas, it often brought together like-minded people. Despite the wealth of available information, not everyone was able to use or access it.

Citizen engagement faced a number of challenges such as dwindling voter turnout and fewer citizens joining political parties, signing petitions or taking part in protests. Three key aspects of social

media and citizen engagement needed to be considered: the interaction between parliamentarians and citizens; citizen-to-citizen engagement; and the watchdog function.

Social media had the potential to enhance citizen engagement because they allowed parliamentarians and citizens to react to each other's online comments. They thus offered citizens an opportunity to contribute to decision-making. Parliamentarians must nevertheless consider the dilemma of the digital divide. Even in countries where Internet use was high, some people did not have access to the Internet or social media. In Canada, about 20 per cent of households did not have Internet access and metropolitan areas had higher Internet access than in rural areas. Parliamentarians who used social media to communicate with citizens often did so like traditional media and did not effectively engage with citizens in an interactive way. Parliamentarians might be constrained by, among other things, a shortage of skills, resources and time, their political parties' approach to social media and the pattern of social media use among the electorate.

Social media allowed people to connect with each other. There was some debate on the extent to which social media lent itself to political engagement. People were divided about campaigning on social media. Some believed that such campaigning could influence decision-making. A recent poll had shown that one in two Canadians believed that Facebook political pages should have little or no influence on government. On the flip side of the coin, the power of social media to connect and organize people had been evident in the uprisings in the Middle East. These connections had translated into street protests. Yet social media could also be used to spread hate messages, the consequences of which could be felt around the world. Rather than blame and shun social media, efforts should be made to use them in a positive way. It should be recalled that social media were part of a mix that formed communications tools.

Social media could help ensure that parliaments were transparent, accountable and effective. They were well-suited to that role because they enabled the rapid dissemination of information among large groups of people. That role also applied to journalists and corporations. For parliamentarians, scrutiny could have partisan motivations: seemingly independent participants on social media who commented on policy issues might in fact be working for a political party or similar organization. Critics on social media sites might be politically motivated. Social media had the potential to allow citizens to perform a watchdog function. That might encourage them to engage with parliaments more generally. In order to perform those watchdog functions, citizens often needed help in understanding how parliament functioned. Parliaments could help by using the Internet to provide as much information as possible on parliamentary proceedings, the role of committees and the legislative process. That sharing of information could in turn help promote honest and harmonious debate.

Their discussions should focus on how to use social media to enhance citizen engagement and democracy. It had been suggested that guidelines be developed to govern the use of social media. Such guidelines would need to strike a balance between the right to freedom of expression and the need to hold persons using social media, as well as traditional media, to account. They could also encourage ethical behaviour on the part of the media and participants of social media.

Citizen engagement should reinforce the basic attributes of parliament as identified by the IPU: representative, transparent, accessible, accountable, and effective.

Mr. A. WILLIAMSON, CEO of Future Digital and former Head of the Digital Democracy Programme at the Hansard Society, indicated that he was currently working with IPU to develop social media guidelines for parliamentarians. There was a conflict between parliament as an institution and its members and the role of social media.

He wished to set the stage by informing parliamentarians of the value of social media and learning about the challenges and problems they faced.

It was crucial to understand that social media were tools that existed in a social context. They did not change the way people worked. Social media should mean business as usual: they should be used among other things for fun, work and democracy. They were tools that had been adopted to suit their lifestyle. He admitted that the advent of social media had meant that people had slightly changed the way they did certain things.

Social media had significantly accelerated the trends in networking and communications, started many years ago already by the Internet. The cycle of news was much more rapid than it used to be, operating in fewer than 140 characters, over a few seconds. The half-life of a tweet posted on Twitter was about four minutes. Within four minutes a comment could travel around the world, multiply and then become obsolete as something else came along to replace it.

It was important to start thinking about the advantages of social media for the public. People built networks of associations based on particular issues. People trusted the people in their networks but had little faith in politicians and political institutions. Social media made politicians more human since citizens could see their representatives and identify with what they said. That did not mean that citizens always agreed with them, but social media tended to draw together like-minded people. That was one of the downsides.

The communications flow of parliament was often one-way, yet it should serve to educate and inform and information should be easily accessible. In the digital age, the hierarchy of media/news was very horizontal. Information needed to be disseminated in as many formats as possible to reach as many people as possible. It should not just be distributed in digital format but should be accessible in terms of language.

Social media were conversational media; they were not bi-directional tools. They were used to open new portals or channels of communication. For example, the parliaments in Brazil and Chile had created their own portals for citizens to comment directly on legislation.

One of the problems facing parliament was that, as an institution, it was rightly seen as imposing, which was intimidating to people. Parliaments needed to open up and communicate with the public. They must devise new ways to come out of their fortress and join people wherever they were.

From a political standpoint, social media had also changed the way politicians needed to think about engaging with the public. Campaigning alone required a lot of strategic planning and thought about building connections and relationships. After getting elected, it was important for MPs to maintain relationships in order to show that they were credible and truly engaged with their constituents.

Social media had created greater accountability and transparency for parliamentarians. Yet it was important to ensure that transparency did not become contingent on democracy or detract from other important issues. Parliamentarians needed new skills – not only the physical ability to get online, but also the information literacy skills to understand what information was available in order to make sound judgment calls.

Parliaments had a role to play in breaking down information to make it more accessible and comprehensible to the wider public in layman's terms. Social media created a unique chance to build a new relationship between parliament and the public. They offered a golden opportunity to do away with the distrust and disinterest and reconnect people with their democratic futures and make them feel that they were shaping their destiny.

He invited delegates to provide feedback before mid-November on the guidelines for social media, which would be posted on the IPU website.

Debate

Mr. N. BALTOLU (Chile) described the Chilean experience. Chile sought to have greater transparency in its laws. Since 2003 senators had digital platforms. It was possible for citizens to share ideas on those platforms and connect with their senators. They had also developed a programme called live democracy, which provided online software for citizens to access the Committees' sessions and put questions to Congressmen and other high-ranking officials. The Library of Congress, which provided support services to parliamentarians, was also using a virtual platform and provided information using new technologies. A virtual citizens' platform permitted citizens to ask questions and parliamentarians to respond to them through streaming or video. Those platforms gave citizens a voice so they could articulate their grievances or demands through the official networks. Chile still had to overcome some communication challenges, in particular the digital divide. The country needed to develop literacy programmes so that the wider public could gain access to the new technologies. He advised parliaments to use social media cautiously. Tweets received from hundreds or thousands of people on Twitter gave the impression of vast information, but did not necessarily represent the opinion of the millions who did not share their opinion online.

Mr. N. PEJMANFAR (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the media has to abide by some basic principles. They should provide equal opportunities to all groups in society to express their beliefs. The media should act in an honest, responsible manner, especially regarding public opinion. It should not be used as an instrument to fabricate lies and should encourage mutual respect among nations and religions. Freedom of speech did not mean that religions could be insulted.

Mr. M. KREISHAN (Jordan) indicated that there was no doubt that press freedom and freedom of expression were very important. Social media played an important role because they permitted the rapid dissemination of information. Freedom of expression was guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as were the rights and obligations of society. Individuals were restricted by certain laws and regulations. All media needed to be honest, transparent, and free of controls and censures so that they could undertake their activities unhindered.

Many people could not use the new technologies because of economic difficulties. Media and information needed to be accessible to all people. Citizens should have access to the same honest information so that they could make up their own minds. Many media failed in that task because of a lack of funding and because they were subjected to pressure groups.

Mrs. S. KOUKOUMA KOUTRA (Cyprus) said that good governance meant participatory democracy, including the use of traditional and social media. For years, traditional media had served as key intermediaries between parliaments and citizens. In Cyprus, that practice continued in order to boost citizen engagement. Traditional media reached the wider public but provided limited opportunities for public feedback, whereas social media had the potential to enhance the active engagement and response of citizens, because they allowed for interaction and the creation of networks.

An independent media was essential and the right to freedom of expression must be protected. In Cyprus, that was guaranteed through the Press Law and the Journalists' Code of Practice. Social media still needed to be fully and properly regulated and their use carried both risks and advantages. One such advantage was the speed at which news spread while a major disadvantage was their ability to provide a partial story and manipulate young people's need for social change.

As parliamentarians they must do their utmost to respond to those new challenges by strengthening the relationship between parliaments and citizens through the use of traditional and new media, ever mindful of the need to guarantee freedom of expression, the protection of personal data and the handling of security issues.

Ms. J.-H. HAN (Republic of Korea) explained that her country had the highest rate of Internet penetration in the world and South Koreans were very active on the Net. The 2011 election campaign had been strongly influenced by social networks and the use of mobile phones, which had enabled greater citizen participation. Regulations were relaxed so candidates and political parties could use SMSs and the Internet during their election campaign. An existing electoral law prohibited the use of mobile applications or SMSs in conducting opinion polls on political issues. There were growing calls to amend those regulations. SMSs and mobile applications facilitated the participation of citizens in the political process. They had diversified communication tools. The world had witnessed the emergence of citizens' networks. More channels were now available for citizens to participate in politics. Institutional and cultural environments must be adjusted accordingly. Parliaments around the world needed to establish an institutional framework based political engagement to manage social media and ensure their effectiveness. Freedom of expression must be guaranteed at all times.

Mr. N. OTANI (Japan) said that the more people's opinions became diverse, the more important it was to use social media. For example, following the Fukushima nuclear accident, Japan had reviewed its energy policy and had recently developed a new policy called "New Innovative Energy and Environmental Strategies". A national debate had taken place and had led to that review. The government had wanted to offer citizens several options to participate in the process. It had followed a more traditional way: hearings had been held in several cities, comments had been gathered, and a number of citizens, chosen at random, had been surveyed on the phone. It had been found that over 50 per cent of Japanese citizens did not wish to rely on nuclear power for their energy needs. That realization had had a great impact on the review of the policy. Bi-directional media had also been used for the purpose of that study and review. Social media had been used to gather opinions from people with different backgrounds. Those consultations had been done at a lower cost and with a higher accuracy rate. Social media had a great potential to strengthen democracy in debates on issues such as energy.

Ms. J. TSHABALALA (South Africa) considered that it was the media's responsibility to communicate decisions taken by the government. It was important that the media were not perceived as being biased and that the rights of all citizens were respected.

The advantage of engaging citizens in the political sphere was that it permitted them to influence politicians in their decision-making. Social media needed to be accessible to all sectors of society. The South African Parliament was pressing for better Internet access and was digitalizing parliament so that citizens could better access its decisions and resolutions. Accessibility of technology was one of the biggest challenges of the new technologies and social media. All must be done to ensure that people did not lose their jobs because of social media, which had the means to empower the people.

Mr. R.S. PRASAD (India) commented that a free press was strong in India. Press freedom was enshrined in the Indian Constitution as one of many fundamental rights. Statistics showed that India had 120 million Internet users, 929 million mobile phone users, 40 million Facebook users, and 16 million Twitter users. India had 68 million newspapers, periodicals, and magazines readers; and 129 million television viewers.

Politicians had Twitter accounts, which could sometimes create political controversy if someone posted an untoward comment online. Those new communication tools had indeed enlivened and strengthened democracy and had prompted democratic change the world over.

The Indian Parliament had its own website on which citizens could propose legislation, comment on issues, and share ideas.

He suggested that an authentication procedure should be put in place for Twitter and Facebook accounts as fake or false accounts could be potentially dangerous. It was also important for the new communication tools to be accessible to all. Currently, the new media were reserved for the wealthy and the educated. Efforts should be made to place them within the reach of the poor and the marginalized.

Democracy remained the instrument of engagement, active participation, personal contact, and influence through delivery and articulation. The new media were taking over their conventional way of conducting democratic election campaigns. Politicians must not sacrifice traditional media. The challenge lay in how to combine the traditional and the new.

Ms. U. KARLSSON (Sweden) said that it was important to protect human rights and freedom of speech on the Internet. Human rights should be respected online as well as off line. The Internet was a powerful source of information and a useful tool in strengthening democracy in the world. It was crucial that online security measures did not undermine or limit freedom of expression. The Internet should be open and accessible to all citizens across the world. During the past five years Sweden's Freedom of the Press Act had been open for review. A lot of the work had focused on the delicate balance between openness and freedom, and the responsibility and integrity of individuals. Another core issue was access to both hardware and content. In Sweden, 85 per cent of the population had Internet access and one third of Swedes had a Facebook account. Some countries were censoring information; that was not a step in the right direction. Countries aspiring to economic development must protect and promote an uncensored, open and accessible Internet. That was fundamental for citizen engagement and efforts to strengthen democracy in the world.

Ms. WU QIDI (China) said that citizen participation was a democratic way for people to take part in political life and access information. In order to fully use media resources and encourage citizen participation, China had adapted its working methods. For example, broad consultations had been organized for over 15 pieces of legislation, including bills on employment, labour and the prevention of water pollution. Hearings and debate sessions were carried live on television or the Internet so that citizens could express their opinion on various issues. Close to 150,000 proposals or recommendations had been received from the general public. The bills drafted after those consultations had reflected the concerns of the population and had attested to their active participation. The Chinese Government also organized exchanges on its Internet portal. Invited guests included members of parliament, jurists and others. They participated in a direct online exchange with Internet users. Debates on important issues such as health reform, food safety, and the adoption of the budget were broadcast on television or on the Internet and were closely followed by a large portion of population.

Ms. S. MAKGONE (Namibia) felt that media could play an important role in citizen engagement and already played a role in informing, educating and shaping public opinion.

Freedom of speech and expression were enshrined in Namibia's Constitution. Namibia's media were ranked 20th on the African continent, on the Press Freedom Index. Currently, citizen engagement was mostly taking place through the traditional media: newspapers, radio and television. The Namibian

Parliament and its committees made optimal use of the media. Social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook were growing in Namibia, especially among youth. The use of social media by government and parliament to engage citizens was limited due to the existing digital divide. The country's distances posed a challenge for infrastructure provision. However, plans were underway for the implementation of e-governance. In addition, the parliament had an Information and Communications Technology Strategic Plan in place.

Traditional and social media were powerful platforms and could be misused to incite violence and hatred. They should be used with caution, especially in countries where infrastructure was not well developed.

Mr. O.-a. KLAMPAIBOON (Thailand) believed that democracy encompassed not only general elections and a checks-and-balance system, but also citizen engagement in State governance. In that respect, the media should promote citizen engagement in politics and governance. They could also play a significant role of informing, educating, and mobilizing the public. In many countries social media had strengthened democracy by playing a watchdog role while in other instances the media had been manipulated by corrupt leaders.

Parliamentarians should ensure that information was accessible to all sectors of society in order to promote public debate, which was beneficial to democracies. Social media could be useful tools in promoting democracy.

Mechanisms should be in place to ensure that media were accountable to the public and that they upheld ethical and professional standards. That should apply to both traditional and new media. He proposed that the following points be included in the final report: the need to promote a favourable environment for the media to be an effective tool and agent for engaging citizens and consolidating democracy; legislation to protect the media and freedom of press should be enacted; media accountability must be enhanced; and social media platforms and technology should be available to all citizens and efforts should be made to improve accessibility in remote areas.

Ms. P. CAYETANO (Philippines) gave an overview of the situation in the Philippines, which ranked 17th among countries with the highest number of Internet users in the world. One in three citizens had Internet access, with Facebook and Twitter the most widely used social media. Parliamentarians had websites, blogs and Twitter accounts; that was a personal choice. People who had accounts could choose to be active or passive. The levels of engagement possible were endless. There was a clear need for accountability for persons using the Internet and social media sites. The challenge was to ensure that people understood the parliamentary process so that they could engage responsibly, work within the limitations of the time and space, remain accountable, and obtain broader feedback since not everybody had Internet access.

Ms. V. MATA (Venezuela) said that in her country, social media had been reserved for a very small elite. Thanks to the Government, the country had sought alternatives for greater citizen engagement. The Constitution guaranteed the right of citizens to fair and impartial information. Many community channels had been created to permit better access to information via radio and television. Those alternatives represented a major force in the country. Parliamentary debates were broadcast on television and radio. The Parliament also used Twitter, Facebook and had its own website. The Venezuelan Government was currently working on a bill to consolidate those new means of communication. The bill was based on popular movements and was pluralistic in nature; its purpose was to enhance the right to communicate.

Ms. J. NASSIF (Bahrain) opined that, regardless of its form, media had a pivotal role to play in heightening public awareness through dialogue and civilized discussion. That in turn would lead to greater stability and participation; otherwise, corruption would be widespread. Social media sites were important as they reached reach many people, especially youth. Bahrain was among the top five Arab countries that used modern media and communications. The country valued freedom of expression and press freedom, which were guaranteed by the Constitution. Bahrain also had a media code of ethics and was in the process of establishing a media city, which would provide services to media agencies. Parliamentary sessions and debates were broadcast so citizens could follow issues and be informed. Parliament had Twitter and Facebook accounts and was also present on YouTube. Those tools had made it easier and faster to communicate.

Mr. T. TESEMA (Ethiopia) observed that information technology (IT) had transformed the way people communicated and engaged with one another: they did so more effectively and quickly. That presented both opportunities and challenges. Social media was neither good nor bad per se; it all depended on how they were used.

Availability of and access to IT infrastructure should be at the centre of the discussion. He believed that social media could be used to facilitate and enhance interaction and communication in society to help achieve social development, promote good governance and empower citizens. Social media shaped political culture by raising the level of awareness on important issues. Social media enhanced outreach capacity and made it easier to engage with citizens and promote their democratic participation.

Parliamentarians must give due consideration to enacting laws and allocating resources in order to provide IT to all citizens. Appropriate measures must be taken so as not to provide technological infrastructure for lawlessness and all must be done to ensure that social media were not used to incite violence. While he recognized that social media could enhance citizen engagement, he felt that viable mechanisms and legal framework should be put in place so as not to trigger conflicts and contradictions among different cultures and civilizations.

Lord DHOLAKIA (United Kingdom) indicated that one of the essential elements of democracy was access to information. Information must be legal, decent, honest and true. Public confidence was shaped by the availability of and access to information. Consultations alone were not sufficient; openness was a key element for a healthy democracy. The UK's legislation on freedom of information allowed the media, citizens and parliamentarians to probe the political process. It made governments uncomfortable, but that was not an excuse not to have it.

He elaborated on how parliamentarians could involve communities in the democratic process. He illustrated a new initiative in the UK – an outreach programme led by parliamentarians. When MPs addressed youngsters in schools, they tried to interest them from an early age, in the election process. In the most recent election, it had been found that only 64 per cent of people voted and that not many young people went to the polling stations. Parliamentarians had a duty to communicate with and educate their constituents.

Ms. B. AMONGI (Uganda) remarked that the co-Rapporteurs had focused their findings mainly on social media. She indicated that traditional media were still very crucial in Uganda and other African countries. In certain African countries, Internet access was still less than 30 per cent.

Some African countries were still struggling with the key concepts of social media. The issue of independence of the media and journalists was very important. All stories must be covered, not just those from political parties that could afford to pay for coverage. It was crucial to make sure that no one could pay for propaganda to influence the debate.

Ms. N. ASKRI (Tunisia) indicated that the media and networking were very important to obtain information. Before the revolution, freedom of expression had been suppressed. Now the media could insult religious shrines and holy books, and could carry inaccurate information. It was important to find a way to control the media to ensure that it carried accurate information and promoted dialogue and a peaceful society. Plurality and diversity must be respected. The truth must be diverse; it could not only be expressed in one way. The media had to control the power of the government and a careful balance had to be struck between rights and duties. Democracy must go hand in hand with accountability.

Mr. T. WICKHOLM (Norway) concurred with the expert that social media should mean business as usual. Those media were open to anyone who wished to participate. It was wrong to think that social media were trying to manipulate society or countries; they were the sum of every opinion expressed. If a person disagreed with an opinion posted on a media platform, the only way to counter it was to follow the discussion, be more active and very persuasive.

As politicians, it was hard to find time in a very busy schedule to be very active on social media. Yet parliamentarians had a responsibility to be available and be part of the discussion. Some claimed that social media tended to bring together people who held the same opinion. Even people with extremist ideas could find other people to agree with. That was why it was even more important for

parliamentarians to be involved and counteract those ideas that aimed to undermine their good work. In Norway, 98 per cent of the population was connected to the Internet. As mobile devices became more and more accessible, people used them increasingly to share and spread their opinion. While he welcomed the debate, he did not believe much could be done to control the Internet.

Mr. M. MELHEM (Palestine) observed that the media should serve the people's interests and not be pressured by governments into misleading public opinion. Abuse of the media could be detrimental to democracy. Parliamentarians should focus on their role of interacting with rather than directing citizens. They should reach out to people who did not have access to television or the Internet. Citizens must be informed of the reality and the various problems that were being encountered. It was therefore important to find ways to deliver information to citizens, either through the press, TV, or Facebook.

Ms. F. JUNEJO (Pakistan) said that social media were capable of playing an important role in democracy. In Pakistan electronic and social media were used for election campaigns. Pakistan was among the top 20 States with the highest Internet use. The Constitution provided a legislative framework for the media. Freedom of speech and press were guaranteed in Article 19 of the Constitution. Social media needed to be addressed in Pakistan's legislation.

Political parties were already advertising their programme and policies on electronic media. Social media were used to engage with citizens by way of consultations, lobbying, debates and advice. Social and electronic media were changing traditional political models.

She illustrated the usefulness of social media in the case of Malala Yousafzai, a 14 year-old girl who had been shot by the Taliban. She had used those media to express herself when her studies had been discontinued at school. She won Pakistan's first National Youth Prize and was nominated for the International Children's Peace Prize.

Parliamentarians needed to enact more legislation at the national and international levels to make social media safe and effective. They also needed to debate the positive and negative aspects of social media, which engaged citizens in decision-making.

Mr. J.-J. EKINDI (Cameroon) indicated that social media are just a medium for information: they could transmit both positive and negative things. The problem with social media lay in the protection of rights. When the new media had emerged, they had created great hope for freedom of expression. Now they were being increasingly restricted. More and more, States were limiting and censoring social media. When a State felt threatened, it took steps to protect itself; often through a blanket suspension of rights. There should be a requirement for such censorship to be approved by parliament. In Cameroon, a law had been passed against cybercrime, including trafficking in drugs and body parts. Privacy should also be protected and laws must protect the interests of both citizens and the State. He recommended that an international regulatory and codification agency be set up with a mandate to introduce universally applicable standards and monitor their application while overseeing respect for freedom, rights, peace and democracy.

Mr. H. ISMAN (Indonesia) said that the use of media in fostering the ongoing relationship between citizens and parliament was indispensable today. The Internet facilitated communication between people. In Indonesia, the use of media and freedom of opinion and expression were guaranteed by the Constitution. In 1999, the Law on Press had been adopted, granting unrestricted freedom of expression. Sometimes the media carried unbalanced news or negative stories. New media and the Internet opened up a range of possibilities for getting rapid information, even if that information was not always accurate, objective or impartial.

He believed that the right to freedom of expression was fundamental in enhancing citizen engagement and democracy. However, it was also important for the media to be professional and accountable in their activities. He called for press associations globally to develop ways and means of enforcing journalism ethics and standards.

In Indonesia, 55 million people used the Internet and 43 million had a Facebook account. The country ranked fifth globally for its number of Internet users. Social media offered endless possibilities for engaging citizens in politics. Most Indonesian parliamentarians had their own websites, blogs, and a social media account in order to engage with their constituents. The House of Representatives posted its parliamentary business daily on its official website and had developed an online complaints and grievances mechanism. Rules were needed to avoid any conflicts caused by the use of social media. A

law had been adopted in Indonesia to prevent and combat cybercrime. Indonesia was opposed to any actions through traditional and social media that caused blasphemy or defamation of religion. Such actions led to misunderstanding and incited violence. All human beings should act in a spirit of brotherhood.

Mr. A. OMARI (Morocco) reported that the International Day of Democracy had been celebrated on 15 September. It had coincided with the last day of the 2012 World e-Parliament Conference, in which the IPU President had participated. The work of the Conference had been extremely valuable and had focused on the subject that was currently being discussed. He proposed that the recommendations of the e-Parliament Conference be included in the panel's recommendations.

Social media had played an important role in the Arab Spring. Popular movements and protests to topple dictatorships had been organized through the social media, with youth playing a key role. That point should also be mentioned in the report.

He asked what role the IPU played in those developments. Did it play a role in narrowing the digital divide between States? Did citizen engagement complement or substitute representative democracy? Were rural populations and the poor excluded from those new media? In Morocco, 30 per cent of households had Internet access and 83 per cent of them used social networks.

How could digital illiteracy be overcome? Some States were still suffering traditional illiteracy. It was necessary to play a role in the digital revolution, starting with the legislative framework. Morocco deplored recent attacks on Islam in the media. A code of conduct or a code of ethics must be developed in order to manage the networks. They must take a closer look at guiding principles for social media.

Ms. M. AL BAHAR (United Arab Emirates) spoke about the experience in her country. Social media were used to communicate with the electorate, even during the parliamentary sittings when issues were being addressed. Parliamentarians were in direct contact with citizens, thus enabling the latter to react to what was happening during the sittings and make their opinion known directly to their member of parliament. That system had its advantages and disadvantages and caution must be exercised when using those tools to strengthen democracy as they could also be used to destabilize democracy. There was no guarantee as to which individuals would be using information and networks. Youth were the main users of social media and had often not fully developed their values; thus they could be easily exploited or manipulated. Citizens might choose to follow movements that did not necessarily strengthen democracy but had fundamentalist leanings. Laws and regulations must be enacted to protect citizens and parliament from that electronic chaos. The idea was not to limit the freedom of expression, but to protect the rights of individuals.

Ms. Z. BENAROUS (Algeria) noted that in Algeria there was a chasm between parliament as an institution and citizens as the electorate. The country had an overwhelmingly young population, accounting for about 70 per cent of the total population. She observed that youth throughout the world were being encouraged to use social media, but they should do so with caution. Participatory democracy was the best means to engage citizens. Communications – new and traditional – could have a strong impact on shaping public opinion. In Algeria, it was important for the remote desert areas in the south to have access to parliament. Parliamentary proceedings were broadcast and available in the regional dialects.

Mr. R.A. NOSHI (Iraq) said that there was some measure of conflict between freedom of expression, human rights and democracy. That dilemma must address the limits of freedom of expression and ensure that it did not overlap with human rights. He believed that freedom of expression had to be limited in order to respect the beliefs of others. That had been demonstrated by the use of social media to propagate hate messages against the prophet Mohammed. That kind of excessive freedom was not beneficial. Social media could lead to the spreading of one-sided indoctrination, which in itself was an attack on democracy throughout the world. As parliamentarians, they had to find new means of communicating with citizens, such as Twitter and Facebook. By using all communication tools – traditional and modern – they could enhance citizen engagement in decision-making and thus strengthen democracy.

Mr. B.V. NEATOBEI (Chad) observed that freedom of expression was at the core of democracy. It allowed the leading players in public life to express themselves and communicate with citizens so that, in turn, citizens felt close to their actions and decisions. Freedom of expression was enshrined in the

Constitution. Chad had also enacted several laws governing press freedom. While the press in Chad had the benefit of liberal measures, it was still restricted by provisions relating to media offences. Ideally, citizen engagement should be manifested directly through traditional media and new social media. The media sector in Chad had been liberalized for over 20 years, but results remained mixed. Freedom of the press was under particular threat from a bill on Law N° 17 relating to freedom of the press. The most pernicious was the sanction against "incitement to tribal hatred". Freedom of expression and opinion was thus seriously compromised.

Given the high illiteracy rate in Chad – 80 per cent of the population – radio was the preferred medium for promoting popular engagement in public affairs in order to enhance the democratic process. During election periods, the Supreme council for Communications, which was responsible for guaranteeing freedom of information and communication, flatly prohibited the coverage of campaigns and the organization of political debates. Despite those impediments to freedom of expression, citizens could still express themselves through interactive programmes, where problems and conflicts were regularly criticized.

All over the world, the new social media provided opportunities for social mobilization. The Arab Spring could not have happened without social networks. In Chad, those tools were becoming popular with young people, but in practice they had not yet become instruments of social mobilization. Chad would have to overcome numerous obstacles, the most obvious being accessibility of information technology and the energy supply. Nevertheless, some progress had been made in the media sector in Chad. Certain constraints had been placed on citizens' access to and participation in the strengthening of democracy, namely: the political environment; control of the public media; the legal and administrative framework; public opinion; and ignorance, poverty and tradition. To allow citizens to gain access to the media and participate in democratic processes, the ruling class would have to demonstrate a real desire for political openness.

Mr. I. ABUFAED (Libya) said that information was a double-edged sword. In positive terms for example, in Libya the media had played a very important role in the revolution and Libyans were now experimenting with democracy for the first time. The government needed to re-engage with citizens and encourage them to participate in political life in order to promote stability and peace in the region. But there was also a negative side: some groups might be involved in harmful or destructive campaigns and provide erroneous or false information. The recent showing of a film on YouTube insulting Islam and the Prophet Mohammed had resulted in hundreds of injured persons in the Arab world.

Mr. K. PUTTERS (Netherlands) congratulated the co-Rapporteurs on their report. He had been present at the World Forum for Democracy held in Strasbourg earlier that month, where that question had also been debated. The added value of their IPU report was that it addressed the possible negative impacts of social media, such as incitement to violence and inaccessibility, while highlighting their usefulness in strengthening democracies. The Netherlands supported an open and positive attitude towards the use of social media.

He asked for clarification of paragraph 36 of the draft report, which called for a "careful balancing of the rights of people to freedom of expression and the need to hold media, journalists and participants on social media to account". He felt that any limitations should relate specifically to incitement to violence and hatred and asked for that to be reflected in the text.

He also questioned paragraph 37 of the draft report, which called for guidelines and mechanisms for holding media and participants to account. In his view, the problem was the message, not the medium. He was not in favour of restricting any medium but rather the message when it led to violence or hatred. He asked that the resolution be formulated in a way that secured freedoms online and offline, while taking precautions regarding incitement to violence and hatred.

Mr. P. MARTIN-LALANDE (France) said that social media were unprecedented tools for creating more possibilities for participation in public life. He then underscored a few of the more sensitive points: (1) The risk entailed in choosing interests that reflect our own image, thereby undermining diversity; (2) The social media depend on the provision of services free of charge. He mentioned the risk involved in services that sell identities or personal information for commercial purposes; (3) Governance of the technical infrastructure of the Internet – make it more global and guarantee its neutrality and its maintenance as a technological tool (effectiveness and fragility).

Mr. M. MUTELO (Zambia) concurred that media – social, mass and traditional – were important for the protection of fundamental rights. Zambia would be undertaking certain media reforms. As things stood, social media were only accessible in urban areas, yet the poorest citizens lived in rural areas and were thus the most disadvantaged. Their opinions and feelings were never heard. Internet access needed to be expanded to rural areas. The developed countries were far more advanced. The freedom and the expression of those who had the technology were frustrating for those who did not. Zambia had three network providers and efforts were underway to provide Internet services to rural areas.

Mr. K. MATHABA (Lesotho) considered that it was important to use social media because that was where citizen engagement took place. There were tools for raising awareness of the parliament among the public and for information dissemination. All media should be given equal rights in terms of coverage. Social media permitted users to interact online. Unfortunately, they were sometimes being misused.

Ms. M. JANGIYA (Malawi) said that social media were very important to democracy. They assisted in educating the masses, made sure that information was accessible to all and bridged the gap between parliamentarians and citizens. However, there were also challenges that needed to be addressed. In Malawi, constituents did not all have access to the Internet even if parliamentarians did.

Ms. A. HABIBOU (Niger) remarked that the media had played a major political role in Niger in recent years. Niger was aware of the importance of the media in the political sphere and for good governance. The country had signed the Declaration of Table Mountain on Access to Information, becoming the first African nation to sign up to that African Union initiative. The Palaver Tree, an online community of oral history, served as a forum for discussion of village life, and had also become a place to listen to national and international news from a radio hung on a branch of the tree. Access to information was crucial for the citizens, which was why the media were so important.

The CHAIR declared the debate closed.

Ms. C. CHARLTON (Canada), co-Rapporteur, thanked the delegates for their input and summarized the salient points that had been raised.

Ms. M.T. KUBAYI (South Africa), co-Rapporteur, also thanked the delegates for contributing to the discussion. The report must be as inclusive as possible. It was important not to exclude persons who had little or no access to social media. While some parliaments were already using social media, they continued to pose a challenge.

Mr. A. WILLIAMSON expressed his gratitude to the delegates for their comments and contribution. He outlined the salient points that had been raised, namely: rights versus responsibility; fear of ghettoization; social media were a critical mass: people rather than the tool created change; the speed of communications that must be managed, when it worked and when it went wrong; and skills transfer to remote areas in order to get people connected and make them knowledgeable and educated. He was surprised that no one had raised the issue of the empowering role of social media for women in a male-dominated society. He invited delegates to visit the IPU website and review the draft guidelines on social media. He would welcome their comments and suggestions.

The CHAIR thanked the co-Rapporteurs and indicated that the draft resolution would be studied at the next IPU Assembly in Ecuador in March 2013.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.

Panel session: Creating opportunities for youth in today's global economy**Wednesday, 24 October**

(Morning)

The session was called to order at 9.40 a.m. with the Moderator, Mr. Scott Armstrong (Canada) in the Chair.

The MODERATOR introduced the four panellists: Mr. Gianni Rosas, Lead expert in the field of youth employment, International Labour Organization (ILO), Mr. Nebojša Stefanović (Serbia), Speaker of the National Assembly of Serbia, Ms. Inger Stoejberg (Denmark), Member of the Folketing and Ms. Eva Abdulla (Maldives), Member of the People's Majlis.

A video produced by the ILO was screened.

Mr. G. ROSAS, Panellist, began by addressing the main features of the youth employment crisis. Youth labour markets had been declining in the recent past except in 2007, a year which saw a sharp decrease in youth unemployment. That had been an exception, however, as the following year again saw a rise. That situation varied from country to country and region to region but had been particularly difficult in North Africa and the Middle East. There were differences in terms of gender as young women were more disadvantaged. There was lower participation among young women and of those that did enter the market more were still unemployed than men. There was also the issue of the working poor, which referred to persons who were employed but still living in poverty. Some young people were working in hazardous occupations, for instance, extreme forms of child labour. Those circumstances had resulted in growing disillusionment among young people, many of whom had given up looking for work. Over time, it became difficult to bring them back into the labour market. Many were trapped in a spiral of temporary employment. That was not a problem per se but could lead to difficulties in transitioning to a stable job.

Regarding the issue of creating job opportunities, he noted a widening school-to-work gap. In some countries, that gap had risen to four to five years between graduation and employment. The inherent difficulty of entering the labour market during a recession was lower wages, which had a long-term impact. They were wasting opportunities by losing the creativity and productivity of youth. Young people risked depleting the skills set acquired in school, which had a negative effect on productivity, not to mention self-esteem and faith in the job market. The ILO had conducted a review of policy framework in 100 countries and had found that very few countries actually had one in place. Some had a project or programme approach, which had only limited overall success. Monitoring and evaluation systems were missing.

He concluded by noting that parliaments could play a major role in easing the jobs crisis by increasing public spending in appropriate areas and taking legislative and policy measures. In addition, it was important to build partnerships and seek contributions from national institutions.

Mr. N. STEFANOVIĆ (Serbia), Panellist, stated that Serbia had been among the countries most affected by the global financial crisis, of which growing unemployment, especially among youth, was a major consequence. He was convinced that parliamentarians had a role to play in ensuring opportunities for young people. Serbia was experiencing a "brain drain" and to curb that situation, the education system required reforms to assist in the transition from centres of learning to the job market. Youth were needed in Serbia for the country to attain its economic potential and appropriate policies were being implemented to that end. There was a new wave of young politicians in Serbia and many young people who had gone abroad in search of jobs had returned.

Ms. I. STOEJBERG (Denmark), Panellist, responded that as Minister of Labour in Denmark, youth employment was one of the most difficult aspects of her portfolio. The new Government was still grappling with that issue. The financial crisis had affected youth most of all, making it increasingly difficult for them to enter the labour market. The main obstacle was the requirement of prior experience. Denmark had reacted swiftly to the crisis by introducing the notion that youth should not be allowed to do nothing, i.e. young people should either be in school or working. Parents obviously had an important role to play but, given that the education system was State-funded, a stipend was given to

students so they could focus on their studies rather than on finding a job to fund their education and living expenses. The lack of coordination between education and job market requirements needed to be addressed. The State was calling on the trade and industry sector to provide on-the-job training, a call that was largely answered. As a result, there had been a 40 per cent drop in youth unemployment. World leaders needed to take necessary steps to address the crisis.

The MODERATOR asked how to ensure that youth were engaged in the debate.

Mr. G. ROSAS, Panellist, responded by saying that the ILO had initiated a consultation process whereby youth could talk to policymakers. Young people had clear ideas and interesting views on how to overcome the crisis. For instance, they had reviewed access to training and internships, the value of entrepreneurship as well as job-rotation exercises. They had also addressed the catch-22 situation of prior experience required for a job. The green economy had been viewed as an area with great potential for job creation.

Ms. I. STOEJBERG, Panellist, noted that the Danish system was different from that of most countries because of its strong social partners. For example, there was no legislated minimum wage because it was tacitly agreed to by social partners. There was that inherent cooperation with social partners which made comparisons difficult but that approach had been working well in Denmark.

Mr. N. STEFANOVIĆ, Panellist, said that training, job rotation and internships were positive steps to address the issue of experience but they must be regional and transregional in scope to ensure greater access.

Ms. E. ABDULLA (Maldives), Panellist, said that 32 per cent of the population of the Maldives was considered to fall in the category of youth, i.e. aged 18 to 34 years. There had been substantial growth in the population as a whole but job creation had not been able to keep up. In the Maldives, there were serious limits to education. First, there was only one university, which had been established in 2010. There were fewer than 20 schools in the country providing higher education and so most Maldivians left school at the age of 16. Given the particular geography of the country and the high density of the population in the capital, the only employing sectors were the civil service, fisheries, tourism and construction. There was a lack of vocational training for Maldivians, which had resulted in an unskilled and uneducated workforce in stark comparison to significant numbers of expatriate workers engaged in professional occupations, semi-skilled and un-skilled positions. The situation was particularly difficult for women. Jobs were available either in fields that were not traditionally open to women, in resorts or in the capital, which required many women to travel from their home island to seek employment. Society and tradition dictated that women were not permitted to live alone in resorts or in the capital and so opportunities were limited.

Debate

Mr. K. DIJKHOFF (Netherlands) stressed the need for maintaining a high level of education. The Government's fiscal policies, such as spending on programmes during economic downturns, must be balanced against rising public debt. He also noted the difference in interests and perceptions among generations, particularly a sense of entitlement among today's youth.

Ms. E. ABDULLA, Panellist, said that there was a need to invest in education. It was a major issue in the Maldives as the country had a sparsely developed education infrastructure. Moreover, wealth was poorly distributed among the population. Economic growth had not filtered down to lower classes. Taxation had been introduced in 2009 but a coup had toppled the government over that very issue.

Ms. I. STOEJBERG, Panellist, noted that Denmark had among the highest taxation levels in the world. Education had been made a priority.

Mr. N. STEFANOVIĆ, Panellist, commented that Serbia did not have a completely free education system as there were both State and private universities. Those institutions were concentrated in the major cities, forcing youth living in outlying regions to find resources to attend universities.

Consequently, they had to work to pay for their studies and living expenses. Serbia must also deal with a low birth rate, an ageing population and the resulting health care issues. More money was allocated to pensions but budget deficits prevented any major investment. Lastly, parliamentarians were concerned about being re-elected, which affected their priorities.

Mr. H. LUCKS (Namibia) noted that the recent social unrest in North Africa and the Middle East as well as the Occupy Movement had a common catalyst – lack of opportunity for youth. That was an issue for the whole world. In Namibia, nearly 70 per cent of the youth were unemployed. Parliamentarians had a responsibility to examine the problem and come up with solutions, not only temporary ones but permanent ones. In Namibia, young parliamentarians attended workshops on gender-sensitive budgeting but no activities were organized on youth-sensitive budgeting. Perhaps the questions should be examined from the employer's perspective: employing a young person entailed a major investment in training and sometimes, the person decided they no longer liked the job or moved on to other opportunities. That represented a risk for employers. That was the catch-22 situation of young people who lacked experience but were not given the opportunity to gain any. Parliamentarians needed to examine mechanisms to encourage the hiring of young people in spite of the risks that carried. One mechanism would be to implement policies that offered employers wage subsidies to employ youth while lowering the risk to business. Another mechanism would be tax incentives to employ youth.

Ms. J. TSHABALALA (South Africa) stated that high unemployment was a key challenge to the South African economy. High levels of growth were required to address the issue of youth employment. The South African Government had introduced a wage subsidy programme that was part of a multi-pronged strategy to foster growth. Government debt must be managed sustainably in order to further funding in education, health care and infrastructure. A balance was required and all efforts must be made to avoid the severe austerity measures adopted in some western countries. The South African Parliament played a significant role in addressing the youth employment issue through various policies and agencies, notably the National Youth Development Agency. Young parliamentarians needed to come together to discuss that issue and work to keep education affordable. The private sector must also partner with the public sector.

Mr. J. MANI (India) observed that the youth population in India – persons aged between 16 and 30 years - comprised 41 per cent of the population. A number of youth development programmes already existed, such as the employment guarantee framework. Ultimately, education was at the heart of the issue. India believed in the right to education and added that that pre-university education was free in India. Nevertheless, educated youth were not able to get a job, perhaps because they were not necessarily properly equipped to do the work. Therefore, education must be reformed to address that problem. Entrepreneurship might be an answer to stimulate youth wage providers instead of youth wage earners. Perhaps the development of incubation centres in universities where youth could generate entrepreneurial ideas and receive financial support could help bring about a change in mentality.

Ms. E. ABDULLA, Panellist, commented that investment in vocational training and public-private partnership incentives were essential because governments often did not have the resources to provide small loans for businesses and start-ups as well as prioritize regional development and women. Responding to the delegate of Namibia, she said that sometimes the youth voice was stifled in giving greater prominence to the gender voice.

Ms. I. STOEJBERG, Panellist, considered that governments should enter into agreements with social partners. It should levy additional taxes on companies that did not employ youth, using the money thus collected to subsidize those that did. The value of entrepreneurship was relative since insufficient numbers of young people would be willing or able to start their own companies, hence the constant need for job creation.

Mr. N. STEFANOVIĆ, Panellist, commented that the Serbian Government was working on specific programmes involving youth who were starting their own business. They had developed a step-by-step booklet to help overcome administrative hurdles. Limited funds were available for first timers but youth should not expect the government to do everything for them. They must concentrate on

educational programmes that focused on concrete issues. Because taxation was choking industry, rates were lowered, which had helped ease the situation to a certain extent. Each country had unique approaches and needs so a universal approach might not work.

Mr. G. ROSAS, Panellist, confirmed that there was no "one-size-fits-all" solution. Technical skills were lacking and entrepreneurship was difficult due to a lack of experience, credit and start-up funds. Financial institutions, perhaps through public policy, might be able to help young entrepreneurs. Mentorship programmes for start-ups could be another avenue worth exploring. It was necessary to increase compulsory education had to be done taking due account of the needs of the labour market to address the educated unemployed. The problem of market duality, whereby some workers were fully protected while others, particularly the youth, had little or less protection, needed to be addressed. Older workers had entitlements and rights according to their age and that was especially true for southern Europe. Was that a sustainable situation? It might foster social exclusion.

Mr. G. COËME (Belgium) observed that, according to the United Nations, the financial crisis had resulted in an increase in unemployment among youths aged 15 to 24 years. Working conditions for many youths were becoming increasingly precarious. The era of the post-war social State had ended. Parents had come to accept that their children might not have it easier than them. Indeed, the current uncertainty facing the youth of today had led to a collective disenchantment that had manifested itself various form, including senseless pastimes, addictions, public protests and even suicide.

The education system had become disastrous for many youths who left the system without the necessary qualifications for available jobs and unable to manage their lives. Moreover, many graduates in areas of poor employment opportunities who ended up with part-time work were often overqualified and underpaid for the work they did get and still lived with their parents at age 30. Employers lamented the lack of qualified applicants for positions in fields of high demand while there were hundreds of applicants for jobs in fields of lower demand. Those aspiring to work in the public service were now faced with the politics of austerity. There was an incredible disconnect that remained to be addressed.

He firmly believed that the reduction of public spending on education, quality of life and employment in the interest of short-term competitiveness was the worst possible approach. That was a crucial issue both with regard to local politics and world governance. Their mission as parents was to adequately prepare their children for the immense challenges they would face.

Mr. K. PANOMKWAN (Thailand) said that Thailand was in the midst of a globalized, interconnected and changing mainstream. Greater efforts had been made in grooming young people who would play an important role in the global economy. The mobility of skilled labour was very important for effective implementation of services liberalization, foreign direct investment and for achieving deeper economic integration. It was crucial for skills-development institutes to join forces with private companies established to provide students with marketable knowledge and skills. New entrepreneur creation programmes had been implemented with the collective efforts of government agencies, the private sector and educational institutes. The development of young people's core competencies was considered to be the crucial link between the educational sector and the work force. Parliamentary oversight must be enhanced to raise the quality of the labour force, facilitate the transmission of skilled and well-trained young people to obtain employment and strengthen the capacity building tools of young entrepreneurs.

Mr. A. FONG (Singapore) noted that unemployment had a particularly pernicious impact on youth. Studies had shown that it was detrimental to future employment and earning potential. In addition, there were also intangible effects such as loss of self-esteem, which could lead to mental stress and anti-social behaviour. Furthermore, youth unemployment was a strain on the public purse. It translated into lost potential tax revenue, placed pressures on the criminal justice and welfare system and meant higher spending on public services. The situation in Singapore was one of fewer youth supporting an ageing population. The pressure on the younger generation will be even greater as they carried the economy forward. Parliamentarians could examine evolving trends vis-à-vis their own situations. Singapore was a small country with an ageing population, which made that issue all the more crucial.

Ms. A. AL QUBAISI (United Arab Emirates) said that unemployment was a problem facing many countries in the world. Youth were disgruntled because of a lack of opportunities. That represented a loss for the economy in one way or another. In her country, measures had been taken to help reduce youth unemployment. One was legislation to support youth working in the public and private sectors through job placement mechanisms that gave priority to youth. Education must also be adapted to the needs of the labour market. She called on the IPU to organize workshops to showcase the experiences of other countries and share best practices in that area.

Mr. R.A. NOSHI (Iraq) commented that the Arab Spring had been started by a youth movement. Parliamentarians must direct their efforts to youth-related issues. If not, the risk of social upheaval would be heightened, resulting in a life of crime for youth. Efforts to curb the crisis should include improved training and education, especially in the area of vocational training, and incentives for the private sector and small and medium-sized enterprises as they would be absorbing a high share of youth employees.

Mr. A. CHIBAYA (Zimbabwe) said that the education system had been reformed to provide the necessary vocational training to feed the labour market. Parliaments needed to formulate policies that were youth-friendly, in particular labour laws. Youth needed to be adequately represented in parliaments and all government bodies. Nothing could be done for young people without their input.

Mr. S. ALHUSSEINI (Saudi Arabia) commented that they were dealing with an economic issue, which required economic policies. Creating opportunities was the result of a high growth rate. The highest unemployment rate, globally, was in North Africa and the Arab world because their youth was not part of the global system. For example, those countries were not members of the World Trade Organization. That disengagement, in large part, had led to the Arab Spring.

Mr. S. SALAH-UD-DIN (Pakistan) observed that first, skills development and training must be addressed. There was a sore need for human resource development and infrastructure to provide the necessary skills and competencies for the results-oriented market. Second, job creation through entrepreneurship required providing support to companies and institutions in order to promote the hiring of young people. Third, across-the-border job opportunities allowed skills and competencies to be valued as global assets. Youth must be educated and prepared for the multicultural, linguistic, environmental and social aspects of the job market.

Mr. T. WICKHOLM (Norway) noted that solid labour laws, strong social partners or trade unions and politicians and parliaments supportive of trade unions were prerequisites for addressing the issue. Scandinavia had been successful through strong and fair trade unions that worked with parliaments. The free education system provided a guarantee for youth to get training or education. Programmes had been set up to promote entrepreneurship in schools. Taxes in Norway were relatively high, but that was viewed as positive and to the benefit of society. Smart taxation considered the balance between the needs of society and support for business.

Ms. S. MOULENGUI-MOUELE (Gabon) said that the problem of youth unemployment must be treated in a methodical and practical manner rather than a theoretical one. There were young people who, despite their best intentions, did not have an opportunity to receive training or to attend school while others, despite their education and training, were unable to find employment. Political decision-makers had a duty and obligation to train youth and offer them opportunities by placing an emphasis on training and the creation of quality education centres. An internship programme must be established by private enterprises and semi-public organizations to provide on-the-job training. Parliamentarians could enact legislation on such programmes.

Mr. E. QUENUM (Benin) observed that democracy could help young people meet challenges through education and training, job creation, the fight against HIV and AIDS and participation in the democratic process. Student unions needed to move beyond idiosyncratic struggles for local or insignificant issues toward a youth parliament with clear and long-term objectives with regards to creating jobs and opportunities. He noted that the problem of youth unemployment was exacerbated by the global economic crisis, poorly adapted public education policies and relevant programme funding, poor governance in many African countries and the inability of parliaments to properly grasp public policy.

Ms. S. HAJ HASAN (Jordan) observed that the challenges were very similar in most countries. Much like the situation described by the delegate of Namibia, Jordan also saw a gap between the output of universities and the requirements of the workplace. Narrowing that gap required greater partnership between the business sector and academic institutions. The introduction of non-academic courses was needed to raise the skills of graduates and make them ready for the workplace. The focus should be placed on sectors where opportunities were more available and on encouraging youth to choose studies in those areas. With regard to young entrepreneurs, she suggested that legislation should be enacted that created a conducive environment and lowered registration fees for start-ups. Young entrepreneurs needed strong connections, mentors and financial support. It was important to keep the youth issue at the top of the government's agenda.

Ms. N. SERTER (Turkey) noted that youth unemployment was a long-lasting and severe problem in areas with high population growth rates. Economic development was creating fewer and fewer jobs due to the high level of technology. She stressed the importance of education, noting that in Turkey, there were 168 universities and education was compulsory until the age of 12. Despite that infrastructure, the unemployment rate among university graduates stood at 30 per cent. Yet education alone could not solve the problem. What was needed was education in areas where there was a need for manpower. Other approaches included tax reductions for establishments that employed a certain percentage of youth and early retirement policies to free up new jobs.

Mr. H. ISMAN (Indonesia) considered that youth should be consulted directly on youth-related issues. Democracy in Indonesia was still very young but the pivotal role of youth had always been recognized in society. Democracy was not perfect but helped solve problems peacefully. The lack of opportunities for youth was eroding basic values in Indonesia. Money politics had flourished during elections, which was sending the wrong message to the nation's youth.

Mr. J. FAKHRO (Bahrain) noted that youth employment was linked to economic growth, which in turn was linked to demographics. The portion of people working beyond 60 or 65 years of age resulted in fewer opportunities for youth. Young people lacked the values required for work and seemed uninterested in work. To address that cavalier attitude, strong links must be developed between education and the labour market. The private sector had an important role to play by providing training and internship opportunities for youth with an appropriate educational background. In addition, youth had not been accorded the same significance as women and children, for whom progress had been made. Youth must be given due attention and adequate budget allocations similar to those earmarked for gender equality.

Mr. D. KAFULILA (United Republic of Tanzania) commented that for most African countries, there might be other ways to solve that problem. Africa was vast and could invest in agriculture but there were insufficient numbers of skilled workers. Only investment in agriculture could ensure growth in that sector. That, he said, could result in up to a 50 per cent reduction in unemployment. The education system was out of tune with the existing labour market. For example, despite his country's extensive natural gas reserves, no local university offered engineering and extraction technologies. There must be a shift in the curriculum and investment in education according to market needs.

Mr. J. GUILLÉN (Dominican Republic) observed that the situation in the Dominican Republic was comparable to most Latin American countries – academic training and education were lacking. Youth did not have education opportunities and were thus unable to get jobs. There were too many young people who did not study or work. They ended up in gangs because they did not have any other avenues available to them. The issue was not a clash of generations but rather that the older generation

was failing to meet its responsibilities towards the younger one. The new government was increasing investment in education and encouraging entrepreneurship based on the premise that if young people could not get employed, perhaps they could become employers.

Ms. E. ABDULLA, Panellist, noted that, with regard to the intervention made by the delegate of Benin, the importance of youth in the democratic process was crucial. With regard to Indonesia, the issue of corruption was similar to the situation in the Maldives, having in both instances discouraged young people from taking up meaningful employment. She underscored the importance of the trade unions and strong labour laws in Norway because, in the Maldives, people could be fired for simply being associated with certain political parties. Youth unemployment had led many in the Maldives to a life of crime. In fact, many had turned to religious extremism.

Ms. I. STOEJBERG, Panellist, concluded that the one-size-fits-all approach was not a viable solution. Their discussion had provided a good opportunity to share experiences and discuss what worked and what did not. With regard to Turkey and the issue of tax reductions, it was important to note that qualifications still mattered. Furthermore, early retirement was only a short-term solution. Some countries could not guarantee a work force in the future simply because there were fewer young people.

Mr. N. STEFANOVIĆ, Panellist, commented that education was at the heart of the matter. They must focus on training and education and must encourage companies to hire young people, perhaps through tax incentives. Local administration and society could play a pivotal role in accelerating economic growth. They must seek local and sustainable solutions.

Mr. G. ROSAS, Panellist, proposed that cultural and other sorts of exchanges could be useful. The Erasmus programme had been very successful in Europe. The question of qualifications also had to be considered as the issue of "transferable" or equivalent qualifications was important. He drew attention to the paradox of having to improve training and skills at a time of financial austerity. That raised the question of examining the national budget by age group. The private sector had a significant role to play in job creation. He expressed some doubts about whether economic growth automatically created jobs. Economic recovery without job growth was possible, hence the crucial role of public policy. Governments had a role to play in industrial relations as some delegates had mentioned. It was important for parliamentary committees to be involved in youth employment and the development of relevant budgets. In a number of countries, 90 per cent of jobs existed in the underground economy. Examining unemployment exclusively meant addressing only part of the problem. Governments had an important role to play in improving working conditions for young people.

The MODERATOR thanked the panellists and participants for their contributions. There was a generation that risked becoming lost and it was their responsibility to ensure that that did not happen. The challenge was theirs, as leaders of their generation, to support that new generation of young people. Policies and regulations must be put in place to help and support youth. He encouraged all delegates to deliver a strong message to the leaderships of their parties and their government that they needed to tackle that challenge.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.

Panel session: Building peace after conflict**Wednesday 24 October**

(Afternoon)

The meeting was called to order at 2.45 p.m. with Ms. M. Mensah-Williams (Namibia) in the Chair.

She introduced the panellists: Ms. Faith Mukakalisa, a Member of Parliament from Rwanda; Ms. Judy Cheng-Hopkins, Assistant UN Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support; Ms. Graciana del Castillo, Adjunct Professor of International and Public Affairs, Columbia School of International and Public Affairs; and Mr. Bernard Harborne, Lead Conflict Adviser, World Bank.

Ms. F. MUKAKALISA (Rwanda), Panellist, spoke of Rwanda's experience following the 1994 genocide. Once the bloodbath was over, the political leadership had devised a plan that had met the aspirations of Rwandans. Noting that it was important to distinguish between the different types of conflict with different origins, she considered that both conflicts between States or within a State had far-reaching consequences. The best way to end conflict was through high-level diplomacy aimed at creating sustainable peace and laying the foundations for a more secure future. Reconciliation was a process by which a country moved from a divided past to a shared future. There was no quick fix to reconciliation and there was no such thing as a perfect reconciliation model. At any rate, peace was less expensive than conflict, both in terms of humanitarian and financial cost. Before 1994, public confidence in the political leadership had been eroded. The current government had put in place a number of initiatives and home-grown solutions designed to promote democracy. Peace would not come to nations until they concluded a meaningful power-sharing arrangement and established a political system based on transparency. A local judicial mechanism based on traditional dispute resolution had been put in place in Rwanda following the 1994 genocide. It had recently been concluded that the mechanism worked well, having heard over two million cases in ten years. Meanwhile, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda was still hearing the cases of some suspects.

Establishing accountability and breaking the cycle of impunity were prerequisites for peace and stability. A National Unity and Reconciliation Commission had been created and had initiated consultations throughout Rwanda on issues related to co-existence. The Commission sought to highlight common problems and promote a common history. The 1994 genocide, in which one million lives had been lost in 100 days, had destroyed the country's social, economic and political infrastructure. Rwanda's unique features had made the healing process extremely difficult. The population had been highly traumatised and deeply divided. The countless cases of rape, torture and murder had had a devastating impact on the mental health and physical well-being of Rwandans. In order to emerge from that traumatic situation, the government, the international community, civil society organizations, the private sector, and the community at large had joined forces to rebuild the country. Special programmes had been put in place, especially for the survivors of the genocide. Women had worked together to preach a message of peace among communities and had conducted activities such as helping orphans and supporting victims of rape and torture. Research had shown that women - if empowered - could have a positive impact on the peace process.

Women were empowered in Rwanda; they accounted for 56 per cent of the membership in parliament. In the past 10 years, the Rwandan Government had been building sustainable peace through national unity and reconciliation, good governance, justice and poverty reduction. Humanitarian support and international and regional aid had been essential in helping Rwanda get back on its feet. Rwanda was a member of several regional and international bodies: the East African Community (EAC), the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) and the Economic Community of the Great Lakes Countries (ECGLC). Parliament had a pivotal role to play in peace-building and reconciliation at the national level. Parliamentarians must commit to examining the country's human rights record. Women parliamentarians in particular played a vital role and worked together with other counterparts to end discrimination and promote the rights of women and children in the peace process. The IPU should facilitate exchanges and collaboration among its Members in order to monitor parliaments' performance in implementing peace-building and reconciliation policies and

programmes. The reconciliation process in Rwanda had been long and difficult but its fruits were now clearly visible. The country had moved from conflict to recovery to a process of sustainable development. Much progress had been made towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). She thanked the UN General Assembly and Member States for nominating Rwanda as an observer on the Security Council.

Ms. J. CHENG-HOPKINS, Panellist, asked what peace-building meant and why it was important. It was crucial to understand that a country could not move directly from a conflict phase to a development phase. In order to get to the development phase after a conflict, a country must invest in peace-building. Countries that had not previously experienced violence very seldom lapsed into violence. Unfortunately, countries that had experienced violence relapsed into conflict violence every few years. In fact, they had a 90 per cent chance of relapsing into violence within five to 10 years. A total of 1.5 billion people lived in contexts of violence and conflict, 42 million people were displaced as a result of conflict and it was estimated that not a single MDG would be achieved in conflict-affected and fragile States. Poverty was 20 per cent higher in conflict countries and while new poverty data revealed that poverty was declining for much of the world, countries affected by violence were lagging behind. For every three years a country was affected by major violence, poverty reduction lagged behind by 2.7 percentage points. A typical post-conflict country was one that had known decades of intermittent civil war that relapsed into violence. It had experienced military domination and/or coups. Post-conflict countries tended to be rich in natural resources, with a steep divide between the small wealthy elite and the poor majority of the population. Those countries had weak institutions and poor public services, a high prevalence of corruption and limited or no accountability and transparency.

Peace-building was multi-faceted; it required the negotiation and implementation of peace agreements and political dialogue. Co-existence and peaceful conflict resolution must be promoted and the economy must be revitalized and generate immediate peace dividends. Essential administrative services must be (re)established. The critical ingredients for success were inclusiveness, institution-building, mutual accountability and sustained support. Explaining the role of parliamentarians in peace-building, she noted that parliament legislated and ensured respect for the rule of law. It also adopted budgets and exercised oversight of revenue management, held the executive to account and took legislative action to combat corruption. In addition, it exercised oversight of the military, provided a forum for national dialogue and reconciliation, regulated State-citizen relations and ensured inclusiveness and representation. Women's representation in parliament was very important. In conflict situations, women bore the brunt of wars as victims of rape and family care-takers. Women's contribution to peace-building was critical. They must be given a greater role in public life and quotas must be introduced to ensure that there were sufficient numbers of women in parliament. Parliaments with a sizeable women's representation were more likely to pass legislation that was women- and family-friendly. For example, in Rwanda, women MPs had reformed discriminatory inheritance laws, increased health care spending and placed the focus of legislation on poverty and children. In Burundi, women MPs had collectively pressed for reform of the Criminal Code to include the definition of sexual violence. It was very important that women achieved at least 30 per cent representation in parliament to make a real difference.

Ms. G. DEL CASTILLO, Panellist, said that the world had been missing the target of achieving peace after war. The most important challenge for countries emerging from conflict was not to revert to war. A significant number of countries went back to war or some kind of conflict after a period of peace. In fact, 50 per cent of counties reverted to conflict, and the majority of the other half became aid-dependent. That was not a sustainable state of affairs; those countries required assistance to stand on their own two feet. After conflict, countries needed to move from lawlessness and political exclusion to some kind of a participatory government, but not necessarily democracy. The rule of law must be established and promoted as well as respect for human rights and property rights. National reconciliation was a *sine qua non*. The Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) programmes could be helpful provided they were sustainable. The reintegration aspect of the social transition was very much an economic problem. Economic transition or reconstruction must entail establishing a basic policy-making framework and guidelines for the utilization of aid. No country could move from war to economic development in one shot; it had to go through a transition phase in order to consolidate peace. Reconstruction was key to peace-building and must be premised on the following factors: national ownership; integration; strategies devised according to resources and capacities; aid channelled through the government (national or local); aid moving rapidly from humanitarian needs to

reconstruction; an implementable DDR programme; programmes for high-level officials; increase support for non-governmental organizations with successful models; create economic zones to jumpstart production/employment; and ensure that the overall political objective prevailed at all time.

Mr. B. HARBORNE, Panellist, stated that the number of conflicts since the end of the Cold War had declined. There were new trends in war and the nature of violence. Other forms of violence were having an impact on the civilian populations even if they might not pose a political threat to the State. Those included gang-related, political and cross-border violence and organized crime and trafficking. Such forms of violence required the intervention of international institutions. Many of those issues were political and had to do with weak institutions. It was very difficult for a country involved in conflict to get out of that trap. Of the 40 countries that had been fragile for five or more years between 1978 and 1990, 17 had remained fragile in 2009. Of the 23 countries that had escaped fragility between 1990 and 2009, 16 had experienced no civil war while seven had experienced conflict. There had been some cases of breakthroughs, when peace was sustained. The World Bank had looked at how internal and external actors could work on creating a virtuous cycle rather than a vicious cycle where violence was perpetuated.

The answer lay in building coalitions, building confidence in key stakeholders and citizens and signalling change early. The key message must focus on three aspects: civilian security, access to justice and jobs. It took a long time to see change after conflict. The case of Rwanda had been a very humbling experience for international organizations. Since then, the many shortcomings of international support had been raised. International efforts were criticized for often being too slow, too volatile, too quick to exit, too stove-piped, and too focused on "post-conflict" windows of opportunity. Much emphasis was placed on the aid going to affected countries rather than peace-building goals. The agreements that had come out of the High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan in 2011 had been very significant: a number of States, particularly those affected by fragility and conflict, had devised a new deal to encourage the international community to lay more emphasis on country ownership, peace building and institution-building goals. In practical terms, two instruments were needed: a fragility assessment and a political agreement between donors, the national government and the population. A critical missing link was the State-citizen relationship needed to create legitimacy. Parliament served as the relay with the population at large.

The CHAIR thanked the panellists and opened the floor to comments and questions.

Debate

The delegate of FRANCE cited Somalia as an example of the need for and challenges of peace-building. A UN-led mission was the only way to secure a country in crisis. In the medium term, trained Somali forces must be able to take over that mission. The country must take charge of its own security in order to move towards peace. A political strategy for national reconciliation in Somalia, particularly in liberated areas, was also needed. Federal and local institutions that brought together all segments of society must be created. Some steps had already been taken, such as a provisional constitution. A civilian political presence that supported the Somali authorities was indispensable. The United Nations had the requisite expertise and experience to deal with such cases.

The representative from PALESTINE stated that the situation in Palestine had arisen due to an illegal marriage between two systems which had evolved from the Second World War. A decision taken in 1917 had allowed the subsequent creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. As a result of that illegal collusion, the State of Israel had been born on historical Palestinian lands. In all, 48 per cent of Palestinian land had been granted to the Jews. Currently, over 70 per cent of Palestinian lands had been given to the Israelis. The Palestinians had signed treaties and conventions but as long as there was no equal treatment what choice did they, as the weaker party, have? A wall of apartheid was being erected within their lands to which they had no recourse.

The delegate of SOUTH AFRICA said that South Africa had gained its freedom 19 years earlier. There had been a realization that everybody needed to talk, come together and co-exist if they wanted to build a new country. That had been the starting point. The talks had been difficult but all parties realized that failure was not an option. During those talks, the people had participated massively in peacekeeping processes. The decision had been taken to make the country's first elections as inclusive

as possible. The country had elected a national unity parliament, allowing several political parties to participate in governance. The Constitution recognized 11 official languages and guaranteed rights for black and whites. Countries must be encouraged to move towards a fair representation of women. South Africa had made great strides and other countries should draw on its experience.

The delegate of INDIA commented that breaches of peace treaties posed many challenges. A complete process was needed that involved rebuilding the country. Even when the violence stopped, justice was required. The Rwandan example had showed that a lasting outcome was impossible without power-sharing. How could elections be held if there was no democracy? Women must play a greater role in economic development and rural development.

The representative from ZAMBIA stated that Zambia had experienced eight years of peace. The key to success lay in the willingness to give up power. The country had thus far experienced three smooth political transitions. Everything depended on dialogue. Zambians had always wanted peace and while there were very different political parties in the political arena, they had nonetheless agreed to cede power.

The delegate of COLOMBIA spoke about the transition from conflict to peace. Colombia had experienced forty years of internal conflict, with a toll of 6 million victims of displacement, abduction, sexual assault and murder. A piece of legislation had recently been passed on the restitution of lands. For a long time aid had been channelled through NGOs and one of the critical issues was that assistance should be channelled through the government. The country was trying to rebuild democracy from the grassroots and one of the ways to strengthen democracy was through its electoral system and the rule of law. Following the energy boom, Colombia had introduced a number of reforms to better distribute the benefits derived from mineral resources.

The representative from THAILAND narrated the experience of southern Thailand, which had suffered from conflict for almost a decade. Parliament played an important role in finding a viable solution to sustainable peace. It had been found that the violence had been caused by various factors, including poverty and social injustice. That in turn had led to incomprehension and mistrust of the local population. A reconciliation forum had been set up so that the various ethnic groups could have an exchange of views with parliamentarians.

The delegate of INDONESIA stated that the country had been experiencing internal conflict. It had been putting in place a peace-building process to prevent conflicts between the states. Institutional and police reforms were but some ways to create peace as part of the democracy-strengthening process. The government had been engaging the local community in conflict prevention. Peace-building had been successfully implemented during the reconciliation process. It was important to assess how the conflict was affecting the civilian population.

Mr. N. SAKAGUCHI (Japan) observed that it was easy to start a war but not to end it. Identifying the root causes of conflict was important for achieving reconciliation. Cultural and religious backgrounds had a major impact on the reconciliation process. The focus must be placed not on retribution and punishment but on compassionate forgiveness. Japan had experienced reconciliation with former adversaries after the Second World War. The international community must provide support and civil society could play a meaningful role based on its sound understanding of the nation's values. The entire process must be based on long-term peace talks.

The representative from the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN stated that he was a member of the Syrian minority in the Iranian Parliament. The international community and the United Nations had failed to maintain peace and security around the world. The influence exercised by some members of the Security Council only served to exacerbate and prolong certain conflicts, with severe repercussions on peace and stability. The United Nations should never be involved in peacekeeping operations. The use of force must be very limited and be applied in conformity with the provisions of the UN Charter. Iraq and Iran had been in conflict for a long time, which had had a devastating impact on Syria. The same scenario was now unfolding in Syria, a once peaceful country where turmoil currently reigned.

The delegate of BURUNDI shared Burundi's experience with peace-building. The country had been a theatre of repeated conflicts following independence. The effects of war were catastrophic. To end the violence, negotiations had begun with mediators, the international community and neighbouring countries. It had taken two years of intense negotiations to conclude a peace agreement and achieve reconciliation. The conflict was fundamentally political and ethnic in nature. There was a commitment to abide by the principles of the agreement and to implement them, and strategies had been developed accordingly. Burundi now had a new constitution, and power was shared by the various ethnic groups.

The representative from NIGER stated that Niger had experienced three coups d'état and a number of rebellions in a 10-year period. The causes of the rebellions were mainly poor governance, the domination of one ethnic group over another and human rights violations. The framework agreements signed by the government of Niger and the rebels had been passed by the National Assembly and enacted as law. Niger was one of the first African nations to establish an independent electoral commission. It had also set up a national political dialogue commission. A UN peace-building project had been launched in regions affected by the rebellions. Its main goal was to secure peace and promote development and through it refugees had been able to return to their villages. The international community's support had been instrumental in making progress in Niger.

The delegate of the EAST AFRICAN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (EALA) commented that countries coming out of conflict were clearly in need of assistance. Most aid institutions provided such assistance with conditions - tied aid - which did not move the country towards economic development. Three out of the five East African Community member countries had been in conflict. She wanted to hear more about the failures and what solutions could be found. Double standards were applied for Africa.

The delegate of CYPRUS observed that since 1974 almost a third of Cyprus' land had been occupied by Turkey. While Cyprus was not at war, it surely could not accept that situation as peace. Almost 200,000 persons were refugees in their own land and a solution must be found to the problem. She chaired the Committee on refugees and missing people. It had set up a community project in a bid to find missing persons. It had called on Turkey to allow excavation in military areas, because it was believed that many of their citizens were buried there. The past thirty-eight years had seen a number of related UN resolutions passed, but still no results. Although Cyprus enjoyed the support of many international organizations, it still had not achieved peace and the reunification of Cyprus. Much remained to be done and she called on the international community to influence Turkey to leave Cyprus, which was too small to be divided but large enough for all its people.

The representative from CANADA stated that Canada was a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and one of its largest endeavours had been its mission in Afghanistan. It was difficult to build capacity in government agencies, political institutions and the judiciary with a literacy rate of about 30 per cent in the country. Even in a twenty year timeframe, those goals might be unrealistic. Public opinion was important for elected parliamentarians. The real challenge was how to reconcile the long-term issues of peace-building with the immediate needs of domestic policy. How should they be channelling their limited resources for development assistance so that assistance served as a catalyst? Were there any examples of post-conflict economic success stories? Could those be replicated elsewhere?

Mr. J. WILLIAMS, Chief Operating Officer for the Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC), noted that it could take countries emerging from conflict decades to achieve tangible results. Those conflict nations were often rich in resources and had a high level of corruption. The presentations on building democracy had made little or no mention of tackling corruption. In his opinion, the focus must be placed on democracy. A total of 1.5 billion people in the world were destitute because they did not have democracy, they did not have a vote and they did not have a say in the running of their country's affairs. The primary objective of all organizations should be to build democracy. The second should be to combat corruption. The answer, while clear, was not simple.

The delegate of SOUTH SUDAN stated that Sudan had been at war with itself for many years and about two million people had perished as a result. In 2001, the people of South Soudan had voted for independence by an overwhelming 99 per cent, the highest vote recorded to date. The challenges facing the country were the unresolved protocols in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the unmarked border. The gains from peace were always fragile.

Ms. S. FERNANDOPULLE (Sri Lanka) commented that Sri Lanka had been able to defeat the most dangerous terrorist group on its territory after 30 years of conflict. She was also a victim of terrorism, having lost her husband, who was a member of parliament, in a suicide attack. Finally, peace had been attained. The government was now concentrating on rebuilding the country's infrastructure. A committee on lessons learned and reconciliation had been appointed. Based on its recommendations, an action plan had been drawn up. Governments needed to be supported in their efforts to achieve lasting peace.

The delegate of BAHRAIN said that in 2011 Bahrain had had to deal with extremists. Misleading information and exaggerations had been carried by the mass media. The people of Bahrain had suffered a lot, which had jeopardized the social peace, but thanks to good crisis management, the country had managed to overcome difficult times. Efforts had been made to achieve national reconciliation with the participation of all sectors of society. The dialogue had resulted in a number of resolutions, many of which had been implemented. Parliament had been vested with the power to bring a no-confidence motion against the government.

The CHAIR gave the floor to the panellists to answer questions.

Ms. F. MUKAKALISA, Panellist, considered that Rwanda was the perfect example of a success story. The 1994 genocide had been horrible: many people had died, some had killed members of their family and others had killed their neighbours. After the genocide, people did not speak to each other; they were afraid. Today, they all lived together. A number of initiatives and projects had been developed. There was now a voluntary option in a traditional justice system. If the accused confessed, the punishment was reduced and soldiers were not punished. A number of initiatives involving the government and communities were underway. Mediation committees had been established by law. Moreover, a development fund had been created to supplement the national budget. All of that had helped make Rwanda a success. Despite the conflict, the killings and the anger, they had managed to make progress and achieve reconciliation.

Ms. J. CHENG-HOPKINS, Panellist, conceded that the international community must admit to both its successes and failures, which required honesty. The aid agencies could and should shoulder much of the blame. She believed that the best kind of aid a country could receive was budget support but very few countries actually received that kind of assistance because it was not seen as transparent or accountable. Rwanda was a good example of budget support working very well. Countries should decline if the donor agencies' proposed project did not correspond to their objectives. Democracy and transparency were essential. Corruption was a cancer that ate away at everything. History showed that those countries that had been able to overcome poverty in the shortest time had not been the most democratic ones in the world: Republic of Korea, Singapore and China, to name but a few.

Ms. G. DEL CASTILLO, Panellist, commented on the issues of corruption and budgetary support. In the case of Afghanistan, most aid in the past decade had been channelled outside the government budget. The small portion going through the government budget was managed by a trust fund administered by the World Bank. Therefore, corruption was not an issue at that level. The problem was that sometimes the World Bank was too concerned about transparency and too slow to act, which created problems for the government. Some programmes had been delayed due to the inefficiency of the trust fund. Much of the corruption in Afghanistan was drug-related and had to do with the fact that the warlords who collected customs revenues did so at the border. In countries where a large proportion of the population was illiterate it was difficult to make progress in many areas. Strategies must be devised based on resources and capacity. The more complex the laws, the easier it was to circumvent them in order to obtain bribes. Regarding the impact on climate change, it was a reverse causality. Conflicts created all kinds of environmental problems. The first conflict country she had worked in had been El Salvador, a major coffee producer. Coffee plants grew in the shade of trees

but during the conflict no one had trimmed the trees so the coffee plants had not produced as much. In addition, people had cut the trees for fuel. Thus, the main source of production in the country had been destroyed, creating all kinds of environmental problems. Haiti was experiencing a similar problem with deforestation. Conflicts caused environmental distractions, which in turn created conflict.

Mr. B. HARBORNE, Panellist, indicated that, per capita, Palestine had been the greatest beneficiary of aid. Clearly that aid had done very little in terms of addressing the structural problems: at the heart of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Aid could only do so much. If there was no political reconciliation, then clearly structural issues persisted. The delivery of aid could be very fragmented. In some circumstances, NGOs could be the most effective way of supporting national populations in highly insecure areas. The government should be supervising and regulating how and where aid was delivered. Budgetary support worked in cases where national governments could provide for their own population. When governments received money from donors, those funds (grants or loans) needed to be ratified by parliaments. International agencies did not have the luxury of providing long-term solutions. Aid was allocated within very short time lines because of the way the money was donated. On the questions of democracy and corruption, he noted that if democracy was only reflected in elections, in many countries elections were problematic and often the source of great instability, such as Kenya and Côte d'Ivoire. Otherwise, they provided very little to the populations represented in those elections, such as the Congo. It was not just a question of democracy per se, it had more to do with institution-building, accountability, transparency and support to civil society. The issue of climate change was slipping down the security agenda although it was very much a part of sustainable security. The evidence of climate change impacting on local conflict was mixed; it was an aggravating factor, but by no means the only one. Climate change was a long-term security issue that needed to be addressed by governments and multilateral institutions.

The CHAIR thanked the panellists and delegates for their contribution.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

Panel Session on Parliamentary immunity: Benefit or burden?**Thursday 25 October**

(Morning)

The meeting was called to order at 9.05 a.m. with Mr. Kassim Tapo (Mali), President of the IPU Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians, in the Chair.

The MODERATOR introduced the panellists: Mr. Juan Manuel Corzo Román, Senator and former President of the Colombian Senate, Mr. John Williams, Chief Operating Officer, Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC), and Mr. Joseph P. Maingot, Former Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel of the House of Commons and Member of the Law Reform Commission of Canada. He stated that the IPU Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians had been seized with many cases involving parliamentary immunity, and was thus especially sensitive to that issue. Some considered it a privilege while others felt it was an absolute necessity for parliamentarians to exercise their duties. The rights in each country varied but there were two well-recognized systems: parliamentary immunity and parliamentary inviolability.

Mr. J.P. MAINGOT, Panellist, explained that there was a long and interesting history behind the common law system that prevailed in Britain and the Commonwealth countries, and the civil law system that prevailed in continental Europe. The protection afforded to members of parliament had dated back to the Roman Empire and the tribunes, where representatives had enjoyed the power to protect themselves. Parliamentary privilege had dated back to 1215, when the rule of law had emerged. The nobles of England at that time had been unhappy with the king's actions and had insisted that the passage of any law be subject to the nobility's approval. That, in essence, had been the origin of the rule of law.

The first type of protection covered security of person and ensured that members arrived safe and sound to their place of gathering. It also included protection from arrest. That power not to be arrested had eventually changed, when the members themselves had decided in 1429 in the House of Commons that they could not use their parliamentary privilege to be protected from the criminal law. It had been felt that the criminal law protected the security of the State and that security was more important than getting an MP to parliament to take up his legislative duties. The next type of protection and perhaps the most important one - freedom of speech - upon which the common law system was based, had taken centuries to be achieved. That struggle had capitulated during a famous event during the reign of King Charles I in 1641, when he had entered the House of Commons and asked all those members who had spoken out against him there to make themselves known. The Speaker of the House of Commons had reportedly knelt before the King and said: "I am the servant of the House here and not yours", and had refused to give up that information. Eventually, the King had been removed and a bill of rights had been adopted in 1689, which had settled the question of freedom of speech for members of parliament. Thereafter, whatever was said in Parliament would not be questioned in any place other than in Parliament.

The French system, prevailing in continental Europe, had not experienced a similar gradual implementation of the rule of law. In Europe, there had been no established parliament per se, but rather the estates general. In France the estates general had met for the first time in many centuries in 1789, with the lords, the nobility, the clergy and the third estate (town mayors) in attendance. Reformation had been in the air. Although the King had not been in favour of the proposed changes, the third estate had separated to become the National Assembly. Parliamentary inviolability had thus arisen from the French Revolution and had spread throughout the world. Every country that had established a parliament in continental Europe thereafter had adopted the same position: parliament and parliamentarians were inviolable. It was interesting to note that the colonies established by those European powers had also adopted the same system as their colonizer.

Freedom of expression was a tool of the trade for members of parliament; it enabled them to do their jobs as representatives of the people, to speak out, criticize the government and investigate and denounce abuses. Parliamentary immunity was designed to ensure that parliamentarians could freely express themselves without obstruction or fear of prosecution. Everyone stood to benefit – the members themselves and the public, knowing that their representatives could speak their mind after consulting

with their constituents. In cases where parliamentarians were above the law, immunity benefitted them alone. He questioned the pertinence of inviolability in the 21st century, where there was a clear separation of powers among the legislative, the executive and the judicial branches. He believed that inviolability was irrelevant to a modern parliament and only served to create an extra layer of unnecessary bureaucracy.

Mr. J. WILLIAMS, Panellist, stated unequivocally that he was opposed to parliamentary inviolability but supported the concept of parliamentary immunity. He then proceeded to define both concepts. Parliamentary inviolability was freedom from arrest irrespective of the crime committed. It had come into being during the French Revolution, which had been a notoriously difficult time as one could easily end up at the guillotine. The King of France had not appreciated criticism and whenever he had gotten wind of negative comments, he declared: "Off with their head!" It was a simple solution for the King, who benefited in two ways: it reduced the number of subjects who were critical of his style of government and it instilled the fear of death into anyone else who dared criticize him. The MPs had been in a difficult position, it was their responsibility to debate and vote on legislation but how could they do so without putting forward the arguments for and against it? The King had taken a special dislike to anyone who argued against his legislation. The same had held true for accountability over the King - who was going to stand up and criticize the King and his governance when he could arrest anyone at will and had the courts on his payroll? The outcome had been predictable – guilty without trial on pain of being beheaded. Against that backdrop, the deputies had decided to devise a simple remedy to the King's simple solution – parliamentary inviolability. That way, they would be out of the reach of the King and his men.

He proposed to compare inviolability with parliamentary immunity, which had had its origin in the English Bill of Rights passed in 1689. Strange things had been happening in England at that time; Charles I had died and James II had come to the throne. There had been religious differences in the country and some sectors of the English aristocracy had invited William of Orange to invade their country. William had defeated King James II in a battle in Ireland that had come to be known as the Glorious Revolution. William had claimed the throne and had ruled with his consort as William and Mary of Orange. But there had been a catch: the parliament had obliged the King and Queen to sign a paper that would become the Bill of Rights of 1689. That piece of paper had established parliamentary supremacy over the monarch and was still in place. The Bill of Rights of 1689 stipulated that freedom of speech in debates and proceedings in parliament could not be impeached or questioned in any court or any place outside parliament. Parliamentary immunity was firmly enshrined in the Constitution of the United Kingdom and in many other countries around the world. He considered parliamentary immunity to be part of the tools of the trade for parliamentarians. Government had all the powers of the State and was subject only to the scrutiny of parliament. Yet while the government wielded tremendous power, that power did not exceed the power of parliament, which could criticize and demand accountability from the government.

In a similar vein, the police was given the power to arrest people and use force if necessary in the performance of their duty. However, police officers did not enjoy that privilege when they were off duty. Judges were invested with the power to sentence people to prison and impose fines on them but a very high standard of ethics and integrity was demanded from them in return. Furthermore, they had no powers when they were not presiding in a court. Similarly, the armed forces had the power to use deadly force but only on instruction from the government, which was accountable to parliament. Parliamentary immunity enshrined in the Bill of Rights of 1689 was the glue that held it all together. Parliament, accountable to the people, not the government, through free and fair elections, was the supreme authority in the land. When people were fed up with their government or their parliamentarians they could vote them out of office and start afresh. That was their choice and it was called democracy.

Parliamentary inviolability, however, crossed the line. It meant that whatever crime parliamentarians committed, they would not be arrested or sentenced. It not only protected parliamentarians while exercising their responsibilities; it protected them at all times. That state of affairs could not be tolerated. Parliamentary inviolability undermined the rule of law. In countries where parliamentary inviolability prevailed, parliamentarians were exempt from the rule of law, but no one should be above the law. The divine right of kings in former times should not be replaced by the divine right of legislators or the State. Parliamentary inviolability carried with it a moral risk: those who enjoyed it were more likely to abuse the privilege because they knew they would not be held accountable under the law. Moreover, parliamentary inviolability was a breeding ground for corruption.

In places where democracy was weak it was not uncommon for people to run for public office in order to shield themselves and their illegal activities from the law. In Russia and some eastern European countries, politicians and senior bureaucrats had stripped their nations of public assets. Bribes and kickbacks from public tenders had inflated the price of goods in countries where people could not afford basic necessities. Foreign aid, intended to help the poorest sectors, failed to be delivered because of corruption. There was an inverse relationship between democracy and corruption: less democracy and accountability led to greater corruption. By some estimates, Nigeria - an oil-rich country mired in poverty - had lost US\$ 400 billion in oil revenue to corruption since gaining independence in 1960. Over 80 per cent of Nigeria's oil export revenues went to 1 per cent of the population. Nigeria had a population of 162 million inhabitants, of which 70 per cent lived on less than a dollar a day. The country's wealth was being stolen from Nigerians by unscrupulous people with too much power and too much money, who used that power and privilege to pillage the country's coffers. That story was all too familiar in many countries around the world. Some parliamentarians in developing countries argued that they still needed the protection of parliamentary inviolability against corrupt governments. He begged to differ: corrupt governments in the developing world existed precisely because too many parliamentarians wanted to maintain the status quo so that they could continue to reap the riches of corruption with impunity. That was parliamentary inviolability in a nutshell and that was why it was still perpetuated in some countries today. He encouraged all the parliamentarians present to take a stand against corruption and political inviolability and to stand up for the people who had elected them.

Mr. J.M. CORZO ROMÁN, Panellist, observed that the topic under discussion went to the very heart of the IPU. The key issue was, in fact, the balance or imbalance of power. Imbalances arose in different kinds of regimes, more frequently in presidential systems or totalitarian regimes. Under those systems, revolutions or popular uprisings against the status quo had often resulted in the removal of powers from the parliament. By divesting the legislature of its powers, private interests were placed ahead of the public good. Even in democracies there had been instances where the media were used by the economic powers to strip parliament of its core functions. In a participatory or representative democracy, parliament might lose power because a presidential system weakened the possibility to legislate, to exercise oversight and to hold the government to account. In some countries, legislation was brought before parliament but all the legislature could do was rubber-stamp what the executive had already decided. That happened in quasi-democracies. There were some cases of abuse of power in parliament where the legislature was infiltrated by specific interest groups or lobbies. Such situations jeopardized the fragile balance of power and the people no longer had any confidence in the parliament because they had seen it lose its power. That had held true in Colombia, Italy and Russia, where the mafia had been able to infiltrate the parliament, resulting in a complete loss of faith in parliament.

For those reasons it was necessary to introduce transparency laws. Parliamentarians had a duty to demonstrate that the parliament was transparent in its voting and all aspects of its proceedings. New information and communication technologies and social media must be used to ensure that everything was reported immediately. People must have access to the truth instantly. He advocated for the use of social media, which had already proved to be very effective in his country. Parliament should not adopt an authoritarian attitude. On the contrary, it must be open and communicate easily with the public in order to gain its trust. Those who had lost the benefits of parliamentary immunity must continue fighting because it was the primary instrument and prerogative over and above all others that established a level playing field with the other branches of power. That prerogative should be used to achieve a balance and ensure that the general interest prevailed over personal interests. In turn, parliamentarians must understand that they had to use that privilege correctly. If they abused their parliamentary immunity, they would immediately lose the respect of their voters. A mechanism must be put in place to ensure that if a member of parliament committed a crime, the procedure for lifting parliamentary immunity was triggered. It would be parliament's way of guaranteeing the public that abuse of authority was not tolerated by elected officials.

The MODERATOR noted that the panellists had presented two very different systems. On the one hand, parliamentary immunity protected parliamentarians in the exercise of their duties. That type of immunity was recognized in Anglo-Saxon and common law systems. It encompassed freedom of speech that continued even after the parliamentary mandate had lapsed and was enshrined in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Admittedly, that type of immunity was often breached, and parliamentarians were prosecuted for language considered to be slander or libel against

political leaders or systems. On the other hand, there was parliamentary inviolability, which some believed was a privilege that ran counter to democracy and equal rights between representatives and voters. Many argued that that privilege was not justified in contemporary society. Others believed that parliamentary inviolability was necessary for MPs to exercise their duty. He had listened with interest to the historical comparison of both systems and while absolute monarchies were a thing of the past, some countries still experienced various forms of tyranny and dictatorship and thus required a high level of protection for their parliamentarians. Parliamentarians must be given the right to denounce corruption and immoral government policies. The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians had been seized of cases where MPs had denounced policies and had seen their immunity lifted to prevent them from speaking out against the government. In his view, a nuanced approach was needed. Certainly in established democracies where the problem of prosecution did not exist it might be fair to say that parliamentary inviolability was a luxury while in others it was a necessity. It boiled down to the delicate balance of power between the legislative, the executive and the judicial branches. In cases where a request for the lifting of immunity was made, the Committee called for the proper procedure to be followed in keeping with international standards. In other words, the parliamentarian in question must be given the right to defend himself, other members of parliament must be allowed to cast a secret ballot and the issue must be debated in plenary and open to the public.

Debate

Ms. R. KADAGA (Uganda) contended that by its very nature, the work of MPs placed them in conflict with the government because they exercised oversight of expenditure and could criticize the government for misusing the country's resources. If members did not benefit from the protection afforded by parliamentary immunity, they could not raise sensitive issues. She drew the panellists' attention to the case of Eritrea: for the past 10 years the Committee had been dealing with the cases of 10 MPs, including ministers, some of whom had been held in detention and denied any contact with the outside world. The work of MPs was high-risk and they needed immunity in order to carry it out properly. It was necessary for MPs to be able to speak for the people and say the truth.

Mr. A. DJELLOUT (Algeria) stated that parliamentary immunity was a constitutional right that allowed parliamentarians freedom of opinion and expression when carrying out their duties, without having to assume any criminal or civil responsibility. It provided exclusive judicial protection for parliamentarians. There were two aspects of parliamentary immunity: the opinions expressed by parliamentarians while exercising their functions were not prosecutable; and from a purely procedural perspective, measures could only be taken against parliamentarians caught in flagrante delicto. Algeria had undertaken sweeping reforms with a view to upholding the values of justice and participative, representative democracy. Parliamentary immunity was both a good and an evil at the same time; it all depended on how it was used to protect parliamentarians in the exercise of their functions.

Ms. Z. BENAROUS (Algeria) remarked that the media was a double-edged sword; it was a tool they must learn to use appropriately. The right balance must be struck between the legislative and the executive. Parliamentarians must have greater prerogatives to enable them to fight corruption. Democracy was in decline, which would inevitably lead to greater corruption.

Mr. M. BEG (India) commented that India had had an established practice of parliamentary democracy for over six decades. Based on his experience, people felt that parliamentarians conferred privileges onto themselves after being elected and were a privileged class, disconnected from the masses. That disconnect could be dangerous; there could be no "us and them", instead there should be "we the people", because parliamentarians represented the people in the parliament. Human nature was such that power often corrupted. The slightest perception of privilege among MPs ran counter to the very spirit of the democracy they stood for. With or without parliamentary privilege, the conduct of parliamentarians should be above reproach. They should be more sensitive to their constituents, hold themselves to the highest levels of probity and make their proceedings more transparent. People had a right to know that their elected representatives were more accountable than them. Parliamentarians should earn respect through their actions rather than demand it. Therefore, parliamentary immunity could be either a benefit or a burden, depending on how it was used or abused.

Mr. T. TESEMA (Ethiopia) explained that in his country, no member of the House could be prosecuted without the permission of the House concerned except in the case of *flagrante delicto*. There were specific reasons why certain protections should be afforded to members of parliament: to ensure that MPs could speak freely, debate and shield parliamentary internal affairs from interference by the courts. Following the MPs expenses scandal in the United Kingdom, concerns had been raised about MPs abusing their parliamentary privilege. He concurred with the delegate from India that parliamentarians should act in an exemplary manner. The solution to the problem of possible abuse of parliamentary privilege lay in each parliament's procedures for dealing with such cases. He cautioned that any proposal for new internal regulations carried the risk of using procedures designed to prevent the defamation of individuals, and thus of suppressing all debate. The abuse of that protection threatened the integrity of institutions and imperilled democracy. Echoing the views expressed by one of the panellists, he agreed that corrupt politicians might use a seat in parliament to conceal illicit activities. For that reason citizens generally perceived immunity as a negative concept and tended to see it as a way for politicians to place themselves above the law. Immunity should be used for the betterment of democracy. If it was used for personal gain it could become a threat or burden. Both Houses of the Ethiopian Parliament had a Code of Conduct in force and regulations existed to prevent members from acting outside the law and to ensure transparency. Accordingly, parliamentarians should focus on strengthening parliamentary immunity regulations by combining public awareness, clearly defined parameters and safeguards to ensure that the procedures for lifting immunity and initiating proceedings were respected. In countries where there was corruption and a weak system of checks and balances between the three branches of government, parliamentarians should do more to control member's behaviour so as to build public confidence in the legislature. For example, legislative reform should promote parliamentary codes of conduct publicized both inside and outside parliament to establish minimum standards of behaviour for members. Similarly, legislation should mandate the disclosure of assets and income to reduce the scope for abuse. In Ethiopia it was compulsory for all MPs to disclose their assets. He reminded the delegates that the role of parliamentary immunity was not to protect individual MPs but to protect the legislature on behalf of the people.

Mr. K.A. KHAWAJA (Pakistan) considered that parliamentary immunity was a good thing. A new debate had begun in Pakistan and in the sub-continent in general: the activism of the judiciary. Currently the judiciary was interfering in parliamentary affairs in Pakistan and among other things, that interference was undermining parliamentary immunity to the extent that attempts had been made to arrest parliamentarians.

The representative from the ARAB INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION noted that certain rights came with the office and MPs must be able to fully enjoy those rights. However, if parliamentarians committed a crime or an illegal act, they must be punished according to the law and their position. That was a *sine qua non*. He underscored the importance of clear procedures for the lifting of parliamentary immunity. It was true that certain parliamentarians tried to abuse that right. He endorsed the views expressed by previous speakers that all parliamentarians should lead by example and adopt an irreproachable conduct. The purpose of parliament was to serve the best interests of the people.

The delegate of CANADA stated that Canada was by no means immune to corruption and was not trying to preach to the rest of the world. In fact, a Commission of Enquiry had recently been set up in Montreal precisely to shed light on a massive corruption scandal at the municipal level in the award of public construction contracts. She concurred that freedom of speech was a core element for the proper functioning of parliament. However, the unchecked or undisciplined exercise of that right was one of the reasons why politics, and by extension government, was falling into disrepute. Parliament witnessed some of the most unbridled expressions and untruths. In her view, parliamentarians were falling short in the area of self-discipline. She called for more stringent measures to control those parliamentarians who abused their privilege. False accusations and outright lies were corrosive for democracy.

Mr. A. OMARI (Morocco) commented that parliamentary immunity was a very sensitive issue because freedom of speech for members of the ruling party or the opposition was crucial to carrying out their functions properly. However, it was important to ensure that no member misused parliamentary immunity in order to enjoy impunity. He believed that a balance should be struck between

parliamentary immunity and inviolability. Having heard the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians the previous day, it had been clear that many violations affected opposition MPs, who were arrested and thrown in prison because they expressed a dissenting political view. All agreed that parliamentarians across the political spectrum should have protection in order to freely express their views, but it was important to protect all citizens too. Everyone should be treated equally before the law. The law should protect everyone - parliamentarians, the executive and ordinary citizens – and no one should be above it. In Morocco both types of protection had existed under the previous constitution, making it near impossible to arrest a parliamentarian. The procedures had been complicated and as a result, there had been many cases of abuse of parliamentary privilege. Following the Arab Spring, Morocco had adopted a new Constitution prohibiting procedural or absolute immunity. Parliamentary privilege was now limited to MPs' activities related to voting on laws and expressing their opinions in parliament.

Mr. J.P. MAINGOT, Panellist, speaking about human nature, said that “Where there is man there is mischief”. He was of the view that the best way to serve the public in parliament was to serve them in public. Parliamentarians must use freedom of expression to denounce kings and governments who did not abide by the rule of law. Inviolability provided for acts that took place outside parliament while parliamentarians should be concerned with their work inside it.

Mr. J. WILLIAMS, Panellist, commended the delegate from Canada for her candid comments about the state of affairs in her country. He reiterated that corruption was a global problem and that given half a chance people would submit to greed and steal. The good news was that the current situation showed that democracy was alive and well in Canada because a Commission of Inquiry was investigating the allegations of abuse of authority and misappropriation of public funds. When he had been the Chairperson of the Public Accounts Committee, it had been discovered that US\$ 100 million had disappeared without a trace. Aided by the law clerk and the deputy law clerk of the House of Commons, he had subpoenaed senior officials in the country to appear before the Committee to give testimony. That was democracy in action and that was why parliamentarians needed the power to hold the government to account. That was the real value of parliamentary immunity. Parliamentarians were invested with special powers and privileges to ensure that the government ran the country for the benefit of all citizens, not for the benefit of the ruling class, the rich or the corrupt, but for all, especially the destitute. There was no place for parliamentary impunity.

Mr. J.M. CORZO ROMÁN, Panellist, observed that the State also had certain responsibilities, such as working for social justice and upholding the rule of law. Parliamentary immunity must be protected and put to proper use.

Ms. J. NASSIF (Bahrain) concurred that parliamentary immunity was a right for all MPs to enable them to conduct their duties in full freedom. She asked whether former parliamentarians enjoyed parliamentary immunity following the end of their mandate, if they had resigned or committed a crime. Currently presidents were being prosecuted for committing crimes so parliamentarians should not be above the law. She believed in the separation of powers but insisted that the executive and judiciary should be respected.

Ms. N. SERTER (Turkey) considered that parliamentary inviolability was indefensible and pointless in countries where the ruling party was flouting democracy and throwing all opposition MPs in jail. In Turkey, following the parliamentary elections in June 2011, eight elected members of parliament had been imprisoned without charge and thus could not take part in the work of parliament. The one thing they all had in common was that they had criticized the government and the ruling party. Under those conditions it was meaningless to defend parliamentary inviolability.

Ms. H. ESUENE (Nigeria) said that although Nigeria had a very young parliament, she had been consoled by what she had heard, since it seemed to be doing a lot better than other countries. The parliament enjoyed freedom of speech and the opposition could move a motion in the House on any topic. That motion was debated and could be thrown out or sent to the relevant committee for further investigation. All parliaments must act as a watchdog for their people. No parliamentarian had ever been sent to jail because of opinions expressed in the chamber in Nigeria. That did not mean, however,

that parliamentarians were not arrested. If they committed a criminal act or were suspected of doing so they could be arrested. If the protection afforded by parliamentary immunity did not exist MPs could not perform their duties properly. However, to extend that protection to parliamentary inviolability was going too far.

Ms. A. NABILA (Tunisia) contended that parliamentary immunity and freedom of expression existed to serve citizens. However, if immunity meant that parliamentarians were above the law and served their own interests, that situation was wholly unacceptable. Concerning procedural immunity, she asked whether police officers had the right to arrest a parliamentarian who committed a traffic offence. In such cases, could MPs be arrested and have their immunity lifted where necessary?

The delegate of ZIMBABWE stated that the immunity they were talking about was what members of parliament should enjoy in the exercise of their duties and did not refer to criminal acts. That type of immunity was usually enshrined in the constitution. It was the kind of immunity that allowed members of parliament to exercise their oversight role and raise issues of corruption in parliament without fear or favour. The biggest issue in his view was that of capacity as MPs sometimes did not understand their own roles or the powers they enjoyed. The other issue was conditions of service, the manner in which the welfare of MPs was handled. In many cases they were patronized by the executive. Other issues had to be considered since members of parliament were usually elected on a party ticket. Some members might not raise important issues because they wanted to be re-elected. The role of party and parliamentary whips was also important. If a party did not agree with an issue one of its MPs was raising then it would use the party whip to bring the member back in line. It was important to deal with the issue of parliamentary immunity in the proper context. If an MP committed a crime he or she must not expect any protection. Inversely, the law ought not to be invoked ostensibly to muzzle thorny or sensitive issues raised by MPs in parliament; that was where parliamentary immunity was most needed.

Mr. J. WILLIAMS, Panellist, responding to the delegate from Turkey, said that he had not heard of any other Turkish MPs disrupting parliamentary proceedings and demanding that their imprisoned peers be allowed to exercise the mandate they had been elected to carry out. He advised her and her fellow parliamentarians to do their duty and demand that those issues be addressed. If done collectively and continuously, news coverage would follow and there would be international condemnation. That was a golden opportunity to build a coalition in parliament and in the wider society to hold the government to account. It was by no means an easy job but it was their responsibility as parliamentarians.

In response to the delegate of Nigeria, who claimed that freedom of speech was at work in parliament and that the legislature served as a watchdog for the people, he reiterated that 70 per cent of that oil-rich country was living on less than a dollar a day. That meant that the parliament was completely ineffective in exercising oversight of the government and ensuring that everyone in Nigeria enjoyed the wealth reaped from oil in their country.

Replying to the delegate of Tunisia, he explained by way of example that in Slovakia, the prosecutor must go to parliament and present his case against an MP before the parliament could lift the parliamentarian's immunity. That should not be allowed; if a person committed a crime, he or she was accountable to the courts, which were accountable to the parliament. That was how justice should be served.

In response to the delegate from Zimbabwe, he concurred that young parliamentarians especially needed capacity-building and education. He had been told many a gruesome story about electoral violence in Zimbabwe. Democracy could be a difficult and dangerous enterprise. His thoughts went out to the thousands of young people marching in the Arab Spring countries, none of whom had parliamentary immunity. They were putting their lives on the line in order to have a parliament that would hopefully serve their interests. He was cynical about the Arab Spring and its great aspirations for democracy because there would always be a ruling class who wanted to stay in power. Citizens in the street needed to know that their vote counted and when they voted for a candidate he or she would seek their interests. Anybody who chose to run for office to escape the law was in the wrong business. He encouraged parliamentarians to stand up and challenge their governments and demand that their citizens be served.

Mr. J.P. MAINGOT, Panellist, reiterated that only a government that subjected itself to the rule of law had the right to demand that its citizens also be subjected to that rule of law. He asked to be kept abreast of developments in Zimbabwe.

Mr. J.M. CORZO ROMÁN, Panellist, explained that in Colombia, parliamentary immunity was not actually a right, because if it was seen as a right then it would become a privilege for the few over the general public. Parliamentary immunity should not be considered as a privilege either because it was a functional prerogative invested in elected officials for a certain period of time. Therefore, crimes committed during that office must result in immunity being lifted so that once the legislative mandate came to an end the MP would be brought to justice and not enjoy any privilege. It was one of the guarantees provided to parliamentarians so that they would not be pressured or persecuted by the other branches of government. In other words, it existed so that MPs would not be arrested or otherwise curtailed in their activities for exercising their duty. The freedom of expression of parliamentarians could also be curtailed through other means, such as the media.

The MODERATOR concurred that parliamentary immunity should be enjoyed only during the term of the office and that former parliamentarians should not be allowed to invoke parliamentary immunity. The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians was currently seized of a case involving former parliamentarians from Bahrain. The alleged facts had taken place while the individuals had still been members of parliament. The case of the Turkish MPs was enlightening: parliamentarians thrown in jail after having been permitted to run for election. Now elected, justice was opposed to the exercise of their parliamentary duties. A mechanism ought to be found to allow them to exercise their mandate, especially since the crimes they were accused of were political acts. The Turkish Parliament had recently announced that it would be enacting a law allowing those parliamentarians to exercise their duty, but had encountered a number of obstacles along the way. The case of *flagrante delicto* applied to all systems, even those that recognized inviolability. There were limits to parliamentary inviolability, for example when a member of parliament committed a crime in *flagrante delicto* he was liable to prosecution without the need to lift his parliamentary inviolability.

Mr. P. PHALUSUK (Thailand) stated that parliamentary immunity had been designed to help parliamentarians carry out their mandate without fear or obstruction. Therefore, it was a legal mechanism designed to safeguard parliamentary practice. In particular, freedom of expression and inviolability were necessary for parliamentarians to represent the concerns and interests of their constituents. The Constitution of Thailand conferred absolute privilege onto parliamentarians in the expression of their views in parliament. Immunity did not, however, extend to a member who expressed opinions at a sitting broadcast on radio or television. For any views expressed outside the National Assembly - if they constituted a criminal offence or wrongful accusation against any other person who was not a minister or member of that House, or if they caused damage to other persons who were not ministers or members of the house - the Speaker of the House could demand that explanations be published upon the request of the wronged individual in accordance with procedure. That did not prejudice the right of the wronged person to bring the case before the court. The system of parliamentary immunity had been devised to protect parliamentarians in carrying out their duties. However, it was something of a burden insofar as it required a balance between protecting the free exercise of mandate on the one hand and upholding the rule of law and penalizing criminal behaviour on the other. The sign of an effective system must be its protection of the democratic system rather than the protection of politicians as individuals. Therefore, it was the duty of parliamentarians to use parliamentary immunity not for personal benefit but for the benefit of the public.

Mr. NHEM THAVY (Cambodia) thanked Mr. Williams for his definitions of parliamentary immunity and inviolability. While he considered that parliamentary inviolability had nothing to do with parliament, he had seen parliamentarians and politicians staking claim to and using immunity and inviolability. They expressed opinions outside the chamber and then claimed inviolability. Parliamentary immunity was a benefit for those politicians who carried out their duties within the confines of their parliamentary mandate but a burden if used to protect politicians against legal proceedings for acts carried out outside the confines of their mandate. It was a burden if it was used to protect politicians who carried out activities in violation of the law and if used to protect MPs whose activities were politically motivated by personal gain. That was currently happening in Cambodia.

Ms. F. MUKAKALISA (Rwanda) said that while she supported the concept and need for parliamentary immunity, some limits must be imposed. The fact of being an MP did not place any citizen beyond the rule of law. In fact, MPs must serve as role models. In Rwanda most laws were drafted by the Cabinet or the executive. When they were submitted to the parliament, MPs debated them, rejected some and sent them back to the executive. Normally, the final word rested with the parliament. The Rwandan Parliament was actively holding the government up to scrutiny, so much so that certain cabinet ministers had resigned because of negative auditors' reports. Any request to have an MP arrested must come from parliamentarians. It was important to set limits otherwise parliamentarians might abuse their privilege.

Mr. R. CHITOTELA (Zambia) felt that immunity should not be confused with impunity. Members of parliament must be able to freely exercise oversight of the executive and must themselves be held up to scrutiny. In Zambia there had been cases where sitting members of parliament had been prosecuted for committing crimes. He could not recall any time where a parliamentarian had been abused, arrested or prosecuted for exercising his oversight function. MPs were given privileges to keep the executive in check. It was clearly stated in the Zambian Constitution that no-one was above the law. Zambia was a model in Africa regarding human rights.

Ms. S. MOULENGUI-MOUELE (Gabon) considered that the conduct of parliamentarians was a crucial part of the equation. Parliamentarians not only reflected their electorate but mirrored the entire nation they represented. There were two dimensions to the issue: the public role of parliamentarians and the need to be protected for expressing their views within parliament and the individual dimension that should lead to exemplary behaviour. If parliamentarians dutifully respected those roles, the question of lifting parliamentary immunity would never have to be raised.

Mr. A.D. DICKO (Burkina Faso) concurred that parliamentary immunity was not a luxury for young democracies such as Burkina Faso. Between 1960 and the present day, the situation had undergone constant change so it would be difficult to say today that his country was a solid democracy. It would be more accurate to say that Burkina Faso was democracy under construction. Europe had achieved near perfect democracy. Parliamentary immunity was needed in his country not only to protect parliamentarians but to bring about peace and stability in the region. His country must erase certain cases in its history so as to strengthen democracy and move forward. That was why Burkina Faso was fighting for parliamentary immunity, but with safeguards to avoid abuse of power.

Ms. S. ESCUDERO (Argentina) believed that in some countries with a long tradition of judicial independence and a strong parliament, it might be possible to dispense with parliamentary immunity. In many other countries, where democracy was still fragile, presidential systems such as those in Latin America, where judges were often pressured by the executive, the prerogatives of the legislature must be preserved. Those prerogatives were very fragile and it was difficult to be in the opposition under that type of system. Parliamentary immunity existed in Argentina but was revoked if a parliamentarian committed an offence. The chamber could also lift immunity. The Congress of Argentina had made great strides in terms of transparency rules through a two-phased process. The first phase involved an analysis of the risks involved with new legislators. For example, the choice of a Senator had been rejected because he had been investigated and sentenced for crimes of corruption when he had been governor of a province. Other parliamentarians who had been elected but were still under investigation for crimes had not been allowed to take up their seat in the chamber. Countries should tread carefully on the question of not protecting parliamentarians in countries where criminal sentences were used as a tool for political persecution. As a result of the fight against corruption it was important to give the public access to information and strengthen the impartiality of judges.

The representative from MALI said that he had understood from the majority of interventions that parliamentarians wished to maintain parliamentary immunity but set limits to it. He asked what would happen to a parliamentarian who was elected and used his immunity as a defence against offences committed prior to his election. Could he be prosecuted during his mandate? Lastly, he wished to know whether it was the executive or parliament that could lift parliamentary immunity.

The delegate of VENEZUELA explained that in 1998, Venezuela had started undergoing a number of serious changes based on popular consultations. Article 200 of the Constitution was concerned specifically with parliamentary immunity, which could be both a benefit and a burden. In Venezuela there were two sides to parliamentary immunity: one began with the proclamation of being elected and the other had to do with the period during which parliamentarians exercised their functions. Both existed concurrently in order to determine exactly when a parliamentarian could request parliamentary immunity. The Supreme Court of Justice was the only body authorized to open an investigation into a parliamentarian accused of committing an offence. The actual lifting of immunity was carried out by the parliament. A debate on parliamentary immunity had taken place in Venezuelan universities involving the general public. The Supreme Court of Justice had issued some jurisprudence aimed at strengthening parliamentary immunity. Parliamentarians were not exempt from justice. He supported parliamentary immunity but cautioned that it should be used properly.

Mr. P. MAHOUX (Belgium) commented that after having presided over the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians for six years, he was more convinced than ever that parliamentary immunity was a necessity. For the hundreds of parliamentarians who had been assassinated, removed from office, prevented from carrying out their activities or prosecuted for political reasons, parliamentary immunity had allowed a defence before the arbitrator. It was important to differentiate between the two types of parliamentary immunity. The first was immunity for opinions expressed while exercising one's duties but which could be lifted for the commission of acts against the law. The second was procedural immunity, which stemmed from the same logic. The parliament could ascertain whether a parliamentarian was being prosecuted for political reasons. It was important to make that distinction and dispel the myth that parliamentary immunity existed to shield parliamentarians from the law. Parliamentary immunity should never be used to allow parliamentarians who had committed crimes to avoid punishment. Parliamentary immunity must exist in the exercise of all political activity. When used to conceal corruption it was not worthy of being called immunity and deserved to be criticized. Parliamentary immunity was a protection afforded by democracy and should therefore not be used for purposes contrary to democracy. As he was no longer a member of the Committee, he could speak freely about cases he had encountered. There were a number of places where the very existence of human rights commissions was considered a hindrance or obstacle. He urged all parliamentarians to denounce abuses and support their peers who had the courage to speak out against irregularities or abuse of power. They must be protected through parliamentary immunity.

Mr. J.P. MAINGOT, Panellist, stated that parliamentary immunity was a practical and political reality dating back to 1789 in France. Yet the immunity enjoyed by French politicians had always led to controversy. Ordinary citizens did not understand why, once elected, politicians were entitled to specific protection. That seemed to run counter to the principle of equality before the law.

Mr. J. WILLIAMS, Panellist, acknowledged the difficult situation of the opposition in Argentina, which was a special case. The country had waged a dirty war in the 1970s, when a military junta had ruled with an iron fist and 35,000 Argentinians had mysteriously disappeared. The junta had given itself immunity for its actions while in office. Subsequently, its members had been stripped of that immunity and now many were in jail. They should be held to account for actions which might have been considered legal because a law had been passed declaring them so, but that did not mean that their actions were moral. Immoral actions should not be tolerated, which was where the role of parliamentarians came in. He recalled the case of Nelson Mandela in South Africa, who had been sent to prison on terrorism charges and 27 years later had become President. He was the greatest democrat of their time, because he had stood up to the regime with no immunity. The South African case was a good example of the value of the vote. The white people had had the vote, had been prosperous and in charge and had demanded that their government give them what they had wanted. The black people had had no rights, had been poor, abused, jailed and mistreated because they had no vote and no power to hold the government to account. That had changed when Nelson Mandela had walked out of jail. Unfortunately, because the ANC had a virtual monopoly, it was currently degenerating into corruption because although black people were in power, the government was not held up to scrutiny. Politics was about building a coalition and the person or party who built the biggest one won. If parliamentarians were willing to stand up for honesty and transparency, parliament would thrive and people would prosper. Parliament was a place of politics where different ideas and ideologies were

discussed without resorting to guns. That was no place for court decisions about whether immunity should be lifted and whether prosecutions should proceed. That was not parliament's job. Parliamentarians must understand the constitutional power they enjoyed and the responsibility that accompanied it. He challenged all parliamentarians present to stand up and do the right thing, stand up for honesty and integrity and stand up for the people who had voted for them, even the poor.

Mr. J.M. CORZO ROMÁN, Panellist, congratulated the moderator on a successful meeting, which he felt had been one of the most important events ever held at an IPU Assembly.

The MODERATOR, in summing up, said that it would be unreasonable to compare the situation of emerging nations with well-established democracies. The many cases handled by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians should serve to remind them that parliamentary immunity was not a privilege but a guarantee for parliamentarians to defend the citizens that elected them. More often than not there was an imbalance between the parliament, the executive and the judiciary. Sometimes governments reacted with repressive policies or invented trumped up charges to prevent parliamentarians from doing their duty. That sometimes led to corruption and members who denounced corrupt actions by their government were taken to court. The onus must be on parliament to rid itself of unworthy members who had committed criminal offences but hid beneath the shield of parliamentary immunity. Limits had to be set to act as a safety net. An MP who was caught red-handed could be taken directly to court without going through parliament. Outside parliamentary sessions an MP could be arrested with parliament's authorization. Immunity was not designed to exonerate parliamentarians from wrongful or criminal activity, hence the importance of respecting appropriate procedures. When procedures were not respected the executive could manipulate the situation. Immunity should enable parliamentarians to accomplish the duty for which they were elected. By protecting parliamentarians in that way, citizens were the ultimate beneficiaries.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.

Panel session: Peak Oil: What prospects for energy security?**Friday 26 October**

(Morning)

The session was called to order at 9.10 a.m. with the moderator, Mr. Saleh Alhousseini (Saudi Arabia), President of the Second Standing Committee, in the Chair.

The MODERATOR, also serving as a panellist, introduced the two other panellists: Mr. Kjell Aleklett, President of the Association for the Study of Peak Oil and Gas (ASPO), and Ms. Anne Korin, Co-Director of the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security (IAGS) and Adviser to the United States Energy Security Council.

Mr. K. ALEKLETT, Panellist, explained that ASPO was an international organization. "Peak oil" referred to the maximum rate of production of oil in any area. Contemporary society needed oil and there were two types of oil: conventional oil and unconventional oil, such as bitumen, shale oil, heavy oil in Venezuela and the oil sands in Canada.

To understand future needs it was important to know where to find oil. Complete data was available for the North Sea region. Peak oil for the North Sea had been reached in 2010. The region could not produce any more than what had already been discovered. The discovery of crude oil and knowledge of its location was measurable. In the United States, crude oil had peaked in the 1920s. It might be possible to find some oil fields but they would be relatively small because most of the large ones had already been found. Experts therefore had a good estimation of how much more oil could be found.

States and corporations do not want to reveal how much oil they had found for business reasons. The cost of extraction of unconventional oil also needed to be considered. For oil sands the process of mining was conducted through steam injection. The oil had to undergo many processes before it could be extracted. For heavy oil in Venezuela, it must be treated before it could be made available to customers.

Ms. A. KORIN, Panellist, observed that in the past, salt had been like oil in that it had been needed to preserve food. When the French had developed canning as a means to preserve food, Napoleon had taken advantage of that technology to march his armies further because of the greater fitness afforded by the newly available food resource. Salt had become less necessary as technology for food preservation had evolved. Wars had been fought over salt in the past, very much like the situation with oil today.

Production capacity was known but reserves remained unknown. The Organization of Petroleum-Exporting Countries (OPEC) sat on 78 per cent of the world's oil reserves but accounted for slightly under one third of production. Either the reserves were inaccurate or OPEC had chosen to restrain production capacity. Neither one of those possibilities was good for the world economy. Supply could not keep up with the growing demand for oil, which resulted in higher prices. The internal demand of OPEC countries was growing very quickly and in the post-Arab Spring era, governments had taken protective measure to avoid similar occurrences. Budget expenditures of the OPEC States had increased due to various living subsidies and budgetary revenues came largely from oil production. All of those factors had led to higher oil prices as those countries tried to balance their budgets.

Oil needed to face competition in the transportation sector and vehicles needed to allow fuel competition. She asked what could be done from a policy perspective to foster such competition. In the short term, she suggested that vehicles be opened to liquid fuel competition, so that they could run on gasoline and alcohols such as ethanol and methanol. The price of natural gas in the United States was very low and so was the production cost for making methanol from natural gas. China was a world leader in that area, having drastically expanded its coal-to-methanol production.

It was possible for automobiles to run on alcohol. The emergence of cars that allowed people to make an on-the-spot fuel choice would create an arbitrage market. However, currently there was only one fuel choice for cars. If the price of gasoline was too high, consumers would restrain their use. A reduction of imports would not improve energy security; it would only reduce trade deficits. Expanding non-OPEC production might help in the short term but would inevitably be matched by an increase in consumption.

Efficiency would not reduce the impact of high oil prices on national economies. In 2008, when global oil prices had increased, consumers had reduced their consumption. Consequently, oil exporters had reduced their production. Taken individually, each action was rational but they had ultimately led to a rise in prices. The liquid fuel tank of electric cars, for example, could be used as a range extender for any kind of fuel. Increasing choice led to increased competition. Fuels would settle to an equilibrium price.

Mr. S. ALHUSSEINI (Saudi Arabia), President of the Second Standing Committee, Panellist, commented that oil was an exhaustible resource but its exhaustion was not imminent. The timing of its exhaustion depended on many factors, such as supply and technology. In addition, demand had been growing less rapidly than before and technology had accelerated the development of other sources. Rather than look at resources below the ground participants should examine those above the ground, such as investment, public policy and technology.

Debate

Ms. M. MULHERIN (Ireland) said that Ireland was dependent on imported fossil fuels. She noted that Ms. Korin had not mentioned the possibility of diversification of renewable energies. She asked what policy decision were needed to make to move away from overdependence on fossil fuels and thus provide citizens with greater choice. She also asked about the environmental impact of fracking. Shale gas deposits had been discovered in Ireland and a debate was underway on the subject.

The delegate of INDIA commented that, given the current realities regarding peak oil, India had taken certain measures with a view to addressing that issue. The development of bio-diesel fuel and hydrogen cars promoted greener transportation. He asked if synthetic oil and hydrogen-based fuel were viable options and what strategic steps had been taken at the international level to tackle that crisis situation.

Mr. A. DJELLOUT (Algeria) noted that increases in the price of oil affected consumers of oil but if the cost of transportation increased, the price of many other products would increase too. The oil pricing structure must be reviewed. Currently, the world was caught in a vicious circle.

Ms. A. KORIN, Panellist, responded to the delegate of Ireland by saying that it was important to separate oil from other fossil fuels which were being used for electricity. The most important policy for transportation was an open fuel policy. Cars needed to allow competition, which could be implemented by public policy. Liquid fuels could take the form of gasoline, ethanol and methanol. If cars could use methanol, they could use a broad spectrum of alcohol and ethers.

If one considered the production and processing costs of oil, for which Saudi officials had quoted US\$ 2.50, it was impossible that a barrel could cost US\$ 90 even with other costs factored in. It was about low supply and high demand.

In response to the question posed by the delegate of India, she replied that synthetic petroleum was very expensive. Another possibility would be to use coal to synthesize gas and then move to methanol. It could be sold as fuel for vehicles or converted to other fuels. Ultimately, opening the market was the most determining factor for driving prices down.

Mr. K. ALEKLETT, Panellist, commented that a large portion of the global population would never own a car. When considering what other means of transport were possible, electricity thus became an important consideration. The US model was not the future model because the price of oil would be high. Did that mean the amount of oil should be increased? No, because that would create a much bigger problem in the future. Instead the world must prolong the time it was able to use oil.

Ms. A. KORIN, Panellist, replied that, with regard to fracking, publications existed on policy options. It was possible to overcome each and every environmental hurdle. Best practices and proper water-testing must be examined. Monitoring was crucial to prevent damage.

Mr. S. ALHUSSEINI, Panellist, commented that the discussion was not about the price of oil but peak oil. They should focus on regulations because as far as pricing was concerned, the market was aware that there were sufficient reserves.

Mr. J. HORVÁTH (Hungary) observed that the world considered energy from a natural resource view and might wish to use a science-based approach to other forms of energy, such as solar energy. To make solar energy economical was merely a matter of technology. There were also other science-based energy sources such as gravity. If the world moved in that direction, was it illusory to believe that fossil fuels would become obsolete?

The delegate of LIBYA said that there was a lot of land in Libya that needed exploration to measure the reserves of oil and gas. Libyans depended a lot on the revenue generated by that export. The new Libya was looking forward to cooperation with partners in the international community. Democratic society was a new and necessary reality. Industrialization would provide employment, diversify resources and make Libya less dependent on oil revenues. He asked about some studies that denied the concept of peak oil. According to the previous presentations, 2003 had marked one peak, followed by 2010. The next was estimated to occur in 2035. He concurred with Mr. Alhusseini's assessment because modern developments every year led to new mechanisms to extract oil. Twenty or thirty years earlier the mechanisms were different. He believed that they were not reaching the peak yet.

Ms. G. REQUENA (Venezuela) stated that Venezuela had the largest oil reserves in the world. The capitalist model was in crisis and there was no solution to that crisis using the neo-liberalism models in Europe. Venezuela was now rewriting its energy history. It was working towards a new international dynamic that would break away with the hegemonic oil and energy powers. Venezuela had the largest concentration of oil and gas, which was why it had become a driving force for the new energy order. She invited the panellists to examine the vast array of South American efforts aimed at lasting integration, a new way forward for cooperation and the relationship between the Union of South American Nations (Unasur) and Petrocaribe.

Mr. K. ALEKLETT, Panellist, in response to the delegate of Libya, explained that resources and reserves were not the same as production peak. The production rate was the flow coming out and available for consumption. The reality of getting oil sands on the market was very difficult. For Venezuela, it was difficult to extract oil out of the Orinoco belt. Peak oil was not about running out of oil but rather running out of the ability to increase the production rate. Solar energy represented a tiny fraction of the energy currently used for fuel. There were limits to progress, for example, batteries required lithium, of which there would be a shortage in the future. Other problems with renewables must be dealt with.

Ms. A. KORIN, Panellist, responded that, with regard to solar energy, it was important to separate the transport segment from the electricity segment. In Brazil, solar power was used to grow sugar cane, which was subsequently converted to alcohol fuel. With regard to policy, electricity was open to new sources and transportation was open to new fuel sources, so the path must be pursued based on science and knowledge.

Libya should embark on a path towards the reduction of fuel subsidies in order to identify a more realistic market cost. That was a difficult step to take as it reduced revenues but it would be for the best in the long term. In Latin America, there was tremendous potential for economically competing fuels. Lower foreign investment due to fears of nationalization would reduce a State's ability to benefit from the technological advancement of private companies. She advocated for less political involvement in the management of energy companies.

Ms. G. REQUENA (Venezuela) said that, since 1998, Venezuela had been undergoing radical changes and exercising its sovereignty. It had enacted policies based on sovereignty and the actions of a democratically elected government. Venezuela refused to bow down to imperialism. Profits would not be allowed to dictate policy and the Government had broken away with the capitalist model and would not kneel down to economic interests.

Mr. S. ALHUSSEINI, Panellist, noted that policies could be implemented locally in different ways. Hungary was making a positive move with regard to solar energy and new technologies. Policies were required to encourage other energy alternatives, which would have a positive impact globally. For Libya, the change in the oil supply side meant a more friendly investment climate and predictable system. He expected higher production because a new environment was considered as more certain for investors. That stability carried an added value.

Ms. F. HAJAIG (South Africa) observed that South Africa produced oil from coal but was now investing in wind and solar energy and biofuels. It had one nuclear reactor and was considering producing more. South Africa had a lot of coal for electricity but the environment impact and degradation in addition to climate change must be taken into account. She expressed her disappointment that none of the panellists had addressed that aspect. Although Saudi Arabia had the largest oil reserves it had decided to promote nuclear energy. She wondered if it would not encounter the same obstacles as Iran in that endeavour.

Mr. I. ALKOOHEJI (Bahrain) said that one per cent of the oil produced in Bahrain was used for electricity and the rest was used for transportation. He asked Ms. Korin if she had approached US lawmakers on the issue of vehicles being opened to fuel competition as the US was the leading manufacturer of cars. He also asked if placing a cap on oil prices was considered anti-capitalistic. Many producer States were on the cusp of important growth, which was of great importance to countries such as Libya for example.

Mr. A. MARQUINA (Venezuela) observed that most comments had dealt with oil production and the capacity of oil-producing nations. He proposed an examination of national consumption patterns and wondered whether creating fuel from cane sugar would result in using up land for fuel rather than food when there was a food crisis.

Ms. A. KORIN, Panellist, in response to the representative from Bahrain, said that she would never support placing an artificial cap on prices. If prices were set too low artificially, demand became too high. A market mechanism was required to set prices according to supply and demand. That said, by placing oil in competition with other energy commodities on a vehicle so that a market-based decision could be made by the consumer regarding fuel options, over time prices would settle among substitutable products to an equilibrium point.

She also said that for the poorest people in the world, such as in parts of Africa or Haiti, moving from subsistence farming to more industrial farming was a good thing. If markets were open and trade barriers removed, they could export their supply and would receive income. The current situation was not one of competing resources.

In response to the delegate of South Africa, she commented that nuclear energy was beyond the scope of the current discussion, but the environmental impact in general from electric transport was better than gasoline because of efficiencies. Alternative liquid fuels were better than gasoline. In environmental terms, coal was worse and natural gas was better; it depended on the source. The poor were more concerned about access to electricity and increased mobility but much less so about the state of the climate in fifty years.

Mr. K. ALEKLETT, Panellist, explained that the reason for studying peak oil was to show that habits and patterns must change. South Africa would be required to find more coal to make its system work. Nuclear power for electricity production could not be stored in the same way as oil could be, in a tank. Replying to the comments made by the delegate of Bahrain, what had occurred in 2008 to the price in oil had been due to the increased buying of products. The Olympic Games in China was partly to blame as the Chinese had ensured full reserves for everything and then consumption had suddenly stopped once the Games were underway. Globalization needed oil, not electricity. Cheap labour was the driving force of globalization, which affected peak oil. In response to the delegate of Venezuela, he replied that environmental impact was an important aspect but noted that coal was more polluting than oil.

Ms. A. KORIN, Panellist, stated, in response to the delegate of Bahrain, that the US Senate and House of Representatives were heading into an election and were therefore unavailable for any approaches. A bipartisan bill would open the field to fuel competition but the political process was slow albeit moving in that direction. Unconventional natural gas had driven prices down with major corporations replacing oil with natural gas. That in turn was influencing the political process. The process would remain slow, with Republicans advocating for the expansion of drilling and Democrats advocating for reduced consumption.

Mr. S. ALHUSSEINI, Panellist, concurred on the need to address the consumption side of the equation. With regard to Saudi Arabia's nuclear programme, the country was seeking out information and signing bilateral memoranda of understanding with certain countries. Saudi Arabia was a signatory to all relevant international agreements.

Mr. K. ALEKLETT, Panellist, noted that Iran wanted to produce its own fuel for nuclear energy, which could be used for nuclear weapons.

Mr. K.A. KHAWAJA (Pakistan) said that Pakistan, as an importer of oil, was subjected to the fluctuation of production and prices. There was a need to enhance investment in the energy sector. He asked why there was no technology and resources to move towards energy diversification. He also wondered why the world was not getting involved in addressing the energy security challenge.

Mr. Shi-Lu CHIA (Singapore) observed that GDP growth in Singapore was correlated to the price of oil. He commented that achieving efficiencies and producing competitive fuels took time. Market forces should dictate price rather than the price distorting the market. He asked what else could be done, in terms of the energy market, to reduce the volatility of the market.

Mr. J. FAKHRO (Bahrain) stated that the most important issue was energy security. It had been touched on but no clear statement on the future of energy security for the next 50 years had been made. He disagreed with Ms. Korin's suggestion that Arab countries had increased public expenditures after the Arab Spring. Revenue from oil stood at more than US\$ one billion a year, which served as a driver for the national and world economy. There was no need to be worried about the repercussions of the Arab Spring on Gulf countries. The price of oil was based on supply and demand and the market was prepared to pay 110 per cent per barrel. This was an example of the market determining price. Iraq and Libya might increase their production and, if they did, prices would drop. OPEC and the Middle East were not to be blamed for controlling the price of oil as they only represented 30 per cent of the world's supply.

Ms. J.A. GENTER (New Zealand) said that although transportation was a major concern, she had been surprised to see the discussion focus on fuel substitution instead of different transportation and urban planning policies. The United States prioritized single occupancy vehicles over any other mode of transport and was thus limited in terms of options. In Europe, there were more options for means of transportation. The United States covered a larger territory and developing countries might not want to go down that path. She was equally surprised that no-one had mentioned the impact of oil on food production. Industrial systems of food production were heavily reliant on fossil fuels, and were thus affected by any variations to oil production or prices.

Mr. J.R. TAU (South Africa) commended Ms. Korin for providing a very good analogy between salt and oil and explaining how lessons could be drawn from the monopoly of salt in food preservation. Letting the market dictate what was done would be a catastrophe. The financial crisis was a good example of the dangers of leaving things up to the market. They must draw lessons from that to avoid a similar crisis in the energy sector. The role of OPEC must be examined to see whether it was working for the developing or the developed countries and for the sustainability of the world. If yes, what was the way forward? In response to a comment made by Mr. Aleklett regarding South Africa's reliance on coal, making the country a "pollution drug lord", he felt that was a misinterpretation. That remark did not take into account the fact that South Africa had hosted a climate change conference in 2011. The country was committed to using coal and alternative energy resources.

Ms. A. KORIN, Panellist, said in response to the delegates of South Africa and Bahrain, that although OPEC only accounted for one-third of global oil production, it sat on 78 per cent of conventional oil reserves. The market, overall, was good but aberrations occurred and, when they did, governments needed to step in. Monopolies and cartels caused aberrations and OPEC was essentially acting as a monopoly. It was made of up independent States so it was normal that decisions were made in their interest. With regard to transportation fuel, the market must be open to competition. That could be achieved through legislative measures, requiring vehicles to be open to fuel competition and thus dampen volatility in the transportation fuel market. Another approach would be to lower regulations that prevented private sector entry into mass transit.

Mr. J. FAKHRO (Bahrain) asked why OPEC production was being linked to its reserve. There was no reserve. It was not normal to dump all one's product on the market. He was not convinced that Bahrain was involved in a cartel or monopoly.

Mr. K. ALEKLETT, Panellist, commented that, although the United States represented only 5 per cent of the global population, it consumed 20 per cent of the world's oil. The rest of the world needed that oil and its production could not be increased as the peak had already been reached. Something had to change. He concurred with the delegate of New Zealand that governments must make decisions, not the market. With regard to food production, he noted that 30 per cent of world's fossil fuel was put to food-related use. Food production was the most important driver of change because of the peak oil reality. Future energy security was an overriding issue as the global population was estimated to increase to roughly 9 billion inhabitants in fifty years. The equal use of energy for the future and how that energy could be attained must be examined.

Mr. S. ALHUSSEINI, Panellist, noted that 33 per cent of Saudi Arabia's GDP went to education and 25 per cent to public health. In response to the delegate of Singapore, he said that producers suffered as much as consumer-countries from volatility. Replying to the delegate of New Zealand, he concurred that agricultural production was critical for the whole world. In response to the delegate of South Africa, he said that OPEC could not control the market with only a 30 per cent stake. When it acted, it did so to secure the supply of the market.

Mr. P. TANBANJONG (Thailand) observed that they must change their habits to better use and manage energy so as not to have to rely on external energy sources. He asked if any statistics or information were available on the difference of energy intensity between the United States, Europe and South-East Asia.

Mr. A. BOUCHOUAREB (Algeria) said that consumer countries would not be in that situation now if there were alternative fuels. He argued for a regime that ensured a fairer distribution of resources. Consumer countries and large countries were running head-on towards the easiest solution. That carried the risk of destroying the most important resource in the world, and threatened the ecosystem. It was necessary to adopt other sources of energy. He observed that a number of countries were moving away from nuclear energy.

Mr. F. BUSTAMANTE (Ecuador) asked if a formula or study existed on the possible impact of the distance between the workplace and home. What would happen if there was no more commuting?

Ms. A. KORIN, Panellist, said in response to the delegate of Thailand that the best thing to do was to adopt a car fuel law to allow flexibility in different fuel sources. She recommended they collaborate with Brazil in that area to benefit from the latter's advanced technology. In reply to the delegate of Bahrain, she said that OPEC had produced the same number of barrels of oil for the past 30 years. It was a monopoly insofar as it restrained production. She suggested that other countries should put other commodities in competition with oil.

Mr. K. ALEKLETT, Panellist, noted that the "business as usual" mentality was not an option for the future. The world could not function without energy. Increasing production would result in a harder decline when the decision was taken to move away from oil. Production had plateaued and it was time to change.

The MODERATOR thanked the Canadian Parliament for organizing the panel session and the panellists for their contributions.

The meeting ended at 12.25 p.m.

SITTING**OF FRIDAY, 26 OCTOBER**

(Afternoon)

The final sitting of the 127th Assembly was called to order at 2.15 p.m. with the President of the Assembly, Mr. D.H. Oliver (Canada), in the Chair.

Item 6 of the Agenda**The institutional and security situation in Mali**

(A/127/6-DR)

Mr. P. MAHOUX (Belgium), rapporteur of the drafting committee, introduced the draft resolution, The institutional and security situation in Mali (A/127/6-DR), and said that the drafting committee had comprised representatives of Belgium, Canada, France, Malaysia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Uruguay. The concise resolution made specific mention of the IPU's support for all initiatives taken by international organizations and leading personalities, including the French President, for restoring peace and democracy in Mali. He urged the Assembly to adopt the resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

Item 5 of the Agenda**Outcome documents**

- (a) Special debate on Citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world.
(A/127/5(a)-R)

Mr. E. QUENUM (Benin), rapporteur of the drafting committee, introducing the Québec City Declaration (A/127/5(a)-R), said that the drafting committee had been composed of representatives of Belgium, Benin, Democratic Republic of the Congo, India, Pakistan, Switzerland, United Kingdom and Zimbabwe. Senator Mahoux from Belgium had presided over the work of the committee. Approximately 50 amendments had been received, many of which had been included in the text of the declaration. The work of the committee had been undertaken in a spirit of dialogue and compromise such that it had not been necessary to resort to a vote on any amendment. The text insisted upon the universal value of linguistic, cultural and ethnic diversity and called upon IPU Members to protect that diversity within all societies and civilizations and among themselves. It recognized the existence of a globalized and interconnected world. The Declaration reminded parliamentarians that they were in positions of power and could effectively improve the economic and social conditions of vulnerable groups, including women and children. The Declaration was well-balanced and concluded with a call to the IPU and its Member Parliaments, the United Nations and UNESCO to join forces in ensuring its application. He invited the Assembly to adopt the Declaration.

The Québec City Declaration was adopted unanimously.

(b) Special Gender Partnership Session on Gender-sensitive Parliaments
(A/127/5(b)-R)

Mr. F. DRILON (Philippines), co-Rapporteur, introduced the Plan of Action for Gender-sensitive Parliaments (A/127/5(b)-R).

Ms. R. KADAGA (Uganda), co-Rapporteur, said that the purpose of the Plan was to assist parliaments in taking measures to become gender-sensitive institutions. It was an innovative step that positioned the IPU ahead of many other organizations.

Mr. F. DRILON (Philippines), co-Rapporteur, stated that the Plan had been developed through a consultative process led by the Gender Partnership Group. The Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians had also played a substantial role. Amendments had been received from Argentina, Austria, Canada, Ecuador, France, India, Morocco, Rwanda, Sweden, United Arab Emirates and Uruguay. The Plan recommended measures in key areas of gender equality: participation, policy and legislation, gender mainstreaming, culture and infrastructure and shared responsibility.

Ms. R. KADAGA (Uganda), co-Rapporteur, noted that delegates had welcomed the Plan throughout their discussions. Not only had women delegates been supportive, but many men delegates had also expressed their support and willingness to effect change in parliaments with a view to gender equality. She asked the Assembly to adopt the IPU Plan of Action for Gender-sensitive Parliaments.

The Plan of Action was adopted unanimously.

(c) IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs
(A/127/5(c)-R)

Ms. K. KOMI (Finland), rapporteur of the Committee, read out the Report of the IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs (A/127/5(c)-R).

The Assembly took note of the Report of the Committee.

Closure of the Assembly

The President gave the floor to Mr. F. BUSTAMANTE (Ecuador) on behalf of the host of the 128th Assembly, the Parliament of Ecuador.

Mr. F. BUSTAMANTE (Ecuador), speaking on behalf of the Parliament of Ecuador, reiterated the invitation to all delegates to attend the 128th Assembly in Quito, Ecuador. Before showing a video message from the Speaker, he introduced the theme of the Assembly, namely: From unrelenting growth to purposeful development "Buen Vivir": New approaches, new solutions.

The video message was shown.

Mr. A. BOUAHARA (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that the work of the Assembly had been marked by enriching discussions on a range of different issues of interest to all countries and peoples. He had been pleased to see a resolution adopted on the situation in Mali. He commented that the Assembly was taking place during a Muslim religious celebration of unity, forgiveness and peace, noting that it was a random coincidence that the situation in Mali was being dealt with on such a significant religious holiday.

Mr. I. NADIMI (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking on behalf of the Asia-Pacific Group, said that the Group's meetings had been well-attended. Senator Drilon of the Philippines had briefed the Group on the work of the Executive Committee and the next chair of the Group would be Japan.

Mr. A. R. RAWABDEH (Jordan), speaking on behalf of the Arab Group, said that the Group had worked over six days and discussed important matters. It had stressed the need to strengthen links between partners for security and peace in Africa and the rest of the world. He noted that the Assembly had adopted interesting resolutions. While many delegates had had an opportunity to enjoy the beautiful city of Québec, he regretted that others had been denied entry visas to Canada. He echoed the call made by previous speakers for the IPU to take into account religious holidays when scheduling its meetings in future.

Ms. T. GARCÍA (Colombia), speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin America and the Caribbean, informed the Assembly that the peace process in Colombia was historical insofar as it had achieved peace after over 50 years of violence. The Colombian Government had decided to resume dialogue with the FARC and was committed to a new peace process that had begun in Oslo and would continue in Havana. She expressed appreciation for the assistance of Norway, Chile and Cuba in the process.

Mr. R. DEL PICCHIA (France), speaking on behalf of the Twelve Plus Group, said that it was the first time in a long while, apart from the annual second Assemblies in Switzerland, that an IPU Assembly was organized by a Member of the Twelve Plus Group. Four important topics had caught his attention: the resolution on the situation in Mali; the Québec City Declaration, which provided legislators with a roadmap for knocking down the walls of discrimination and exclusion; an ambitious Plan of Action for Gender-sensitive Parliaments and the panel discussion on the responsibility to protect, which reminded them all of the tragic situation in Syria.

The PRESIDENT OF THE IPU said that it had been a fruitful Assembly with high-quality debates. At the opening he had said that the Québec City Assembly would be special because of its unique programme, and he had been right. He paid tribute to all the geopolitical groups, heads of delegations, Speakers and support staff. He thanked the Secretary-General and the IPU Secretariat for their devotion and hard work, the organizers of the Assembly for their patience and the team of interpreters for their competence.

The PRESIDENT thanked all the delegates who had attended the 127th Assembly. He commended the Assembly on its work, which had included discussions on a wide range of important topics. He had been impressed by the quality of debates and spirited exchange of views. The talks had been frank, direct and possible only due to the very active participation of delegates and the impressive line-up of speakers and panellists.

With regard to the topic of the Special Debate, he offered some personal reflections. He had been very impressed with the quality of interventions, emphasizing the wide range of experiences with diversity, from the moderate to the extreme. Given the breadth of the subject matter, he noted that the debate had merely scratched the surface of diversity in an age of globalization.

The deliberations had held true to the values and spirit of the IPU – a commitment to honest, frank and respectful dialogue. He said that only by continuing the discussion could the integrity needed to find sound solutions to the challenges raised at the Assembly be maintained. He noted that those were difficult times for parliamentary diplomacy given the range of crises and concerns. He asked delegates to take the coming days, weeks and years to reflect on the tenor of the discussions held during the Assembly and the action they needed to take for future generations both individually and collectively as parliamentarians.

The Assembly closed at 3.30 p.m.

THE INSTITUTIONAL AND SECURITY SITUATION IN MALI**Resolution adopted unanimously by the 127th IPU Assembly
(Québec City, 26 October 2012)**

The 127th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Considering the worsening situation of insecurity in the north of the country following the region's occupation since January 2012 by armed terrorist, fundamentalist and separatist groups with links to drug trafficking rings,

Considering the continuing deterioration of the humanitarian situation resulting therefrom and the numerous human rights violations perpetrated by these groups of terrorists, fundamentalists and separatists, in particular amputations, stoning, murders, rape and other acts of sexual violence as well as theft, pillaging and the destruction of cultural and religious world heritage sites,

Considering the Malian people's attachment to a secular and indivisible Republic of Mali,

Considering that the international community has unanimously condemned the affront to Mali's territorial integrity,

Considering the efforts deployed by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the African Union (AU), the European Union (EU) and the United Nations to solve the institutional and security crisis, which is reversing all the development gains made by the Malian people,

Considering:

- (a) the presidential statement on Mali endorsed by the 126th IPU Assembly on 5 April 2012,
- (b) European Parliament resolution 2012/2603(RSP) of 20 April 2012 on the situation in Mali,
- (c) ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly resolution ACP-EU/101-157/A of 30 May 2012,
- (d) the ECOWAS Parliament resolution of 8 October 2012 on developments in the process of managing the political and security crisis in the Republic of Mali,

Considering the requests made by the transitional authorities to ECOWAS and the international community for assistance to the Malian armed forces with a view to liberating the north of the country, in particular the request made by the acting President of the Republic to the UN Secretary-General for the deployment of an international military force in Mali in accordance with a UN Security Council resolution and by virtue of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

Considering similar requests made by ECOWAS and supported by the African Union, the French President and others to the UN Secretary-General,

Considering UN Security Council resolution 2071 (2012) adopted on 15 October 2012 by virtue of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, with a view to the deployment of an international armed force to restore the territorial integrity of Mali,

Recalling UN Security Council resolutions 1325, 1820, 1888 and 1889 on women, peace and security, in which the Security Council calls for women to be fully involved in all decision-making related to conflict prevention, mediation, peacekeeping and post-conflict peacebuilding,

Considering the commitment made by the EU to dispatch military instructors to reorganize the national armed forces,

Considering the meeting of the Support and Follow-up Group on Mali, held on 19 October 2012 in Bamako,

1. Reaffirms its unreserved attachment to the integrity and unity of Mali, the secular nature of the Republic and the country's national sovereignty, which belongs to the Malian people alone;

2. Condemns the serious human rights abuses and violations of international humanitarian law committed in the north of the country by armed rebels and groups of terrorists, fundamentalists and separatists, in particular acts of violence against civilians, notably women and children, murders, amputations and stoning, as well as pillaging and the destruction of cultural and religious world heritage sites;
3. Welcomes the initiative taken by the acting President of the Republic to seek the support of ECOWAS and the international community in liberating the north of the country;
4. Congratulates ECOWAS and the AU on providing support to the Malian people in their fight against terrorism and the groups of rebels and extremists occupying the north of the country;
5. Welcomes the commitment made by the EU and the United Nations to help Mali rid itself of the terrorist groups holding sway in the north of the country;
6. Also welcomes the commitment and political will clearly expressed by the French President in support of the Malian people's struggle to liberate the north of the country and his endeavours to resolve the unprecedented institutional and security crisis facing the country;
7. Appeals to the countries of the subregion to do all they can to maintain calm and security in the Sahel-Saharan belt;
8. Urges the transitional authorities in Mali to ensure that women can fully and meaningfully participate in all decision-making processes related to peacebuilding and governance;
9. Thanks the countries of the Support and Follow-up Group on Mali for their initiatives to help the Malian armed forces retake the north of the country;
10. Welcomes the resolution adopted by the Security Council with a view to sending an international military force to help the national armed forces retake control of the occupied regions in the north of the country;
11. Urges the armed forces of Mali to cooperate fully with the international military force to be deployed;
12. Also urges the transitional government to do all in its power, in keeping with its road map, to regain control of the north of the country and hold free and fair elections once the crisis has abated;
13. Expresses its unreserved support for the strategy presented by the UN Secretary-General with a view to mobilizing all agencies, funds and programmes as well as international financial institutions for the Sahel;
14. Calls on the international community to lift sanctions and on technical and financial partners to resume cooperation with Mali following the approval of a road map by the AU on 24 October 2012;
15. Requests the relevant international organizations as well as donor countries and agencies, in conjunction with non-governmental organizations operating in the region, to provide emergency food aid, drinking water and shelter for Malian refugees and displaced persons and to facilitate the release of hostages;
16. Entrusts the IPU with conveying this resolution to all its Members, Associate Members and Observers and other international organizations.

SPECIAL DEBATE**CITIZENSHIP, IDENTITY AND LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY
IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD****QUEBEC CITY DECLARATION****Adopted by the 127th IPU Assembly
(Québec City, 26 October 2012)**

1. We, members of parliament gathering in Québec City on the occasion of the 127th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, firmly uphold cultural, linguistic, ethnic, racial, political and religious diversity as a global value which should be celebrated, respected, encouraged and protected within and among all societies and civilizations.
2. We are convinced that a diversity of ideas, values, beliefs, languages and cultural expressions among peoples and civilizations enriches our outlook and experiences at the national, regional and international levels.
3. We affirm our aspiration to attain harmony and unity in our diversity and the reconciliation of human cultures. We believe that a world where people with their differences co-exist is possible, one where there is awareness of differential solidarity and where a dialogue of civilizations is encouraged. Such a world, which depends on our mutual understanding and acceptance, would be a source of progress for humanity and would lead to the well-being of our global society.
4. All individuals must be allowed the full enjoyment of their equal and inalienable rights recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights and humanitarian law treaties and standards. Limitations or restrictions on any of these rights must be consistent with international law, necessary and proportionate. They should not lead to any discrimination whatsoever based on culture, race, colour, language, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation or political affiliation.
5. States thus have an obligation to respect, protect, fulfil and promote the interconnected civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of all individuals. In order to prevent uniformity, each State, together with civil society, must play its role in developing and implementing cultural policies, including by providing the requisite means and creating an enabling environment.
6. We affirm the importance of balancing respect for diversity with social inclusiveness and cohesion as a means of building trust within and among societies and as a sine qua non for progress, prosperity and a high quality of life. Differences of language, culture, ethnicity, religion, belief, race and colour are evident in many societies, with no single experience common to all others. In accordance with international law and standards, each society's efforts to guarantee these rights will reflect its historical, political, economic and social circumstances. The variety of experiences with diversity among societies and civilizations makes it possible to have a constructive exchange of best practices and innovative ideas about the promotion of inclusiveness while respecting diversity.
7. The diversity of our societies and civilizations is a prominent feature of our ever more globalized and interconnected world. People and societies are in closer and more frequent contact because of many forces, such as past and recent migration trends, technological advances in communication and transportation and new and more integrated patterns of regional and global trade. These developments have resulted in greater awareness of different ideas and values, as well as in closer ties between various communities and their countries of origin.
8. In a world of deepening global and regional linkages and interdependence, States, international organizations and civil society are increasingly cooperating to mitigate the consequences of economic distress, natural disasters and conflicts, events which we believe should not serve as pretexts for restricting diversity or violating fundamental human rights.

9. Diversity in a globalized world can facilitate the efforts of States and national parliaments to navigate the complexities of the 21st century by offering opportunities to share different perspectives and ideas on common issues. In so doing, we enhance our knowledge and innovation, develop our shared human capital, promote mutual awareness and understanding of differences and commonalities and enable opportunities for peace and prosperity.
10. We are concerned and deeply regret that alienation, intolerance, distrust, racism, aggressive nationalism, ethnocentrism and xenophobia against groups and individuals belonging to religious, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, racial and other communities, among other disturbing forms of discrimination and prejudice, have persisted.
11. While reaffirming our commitment to the right to freedom of thought, opinion and expression, we strongly and unequivocally condemn all acts which intimidate and incite to extremism, radicalization, hatred, racism, xenophobia and violence. We reiterate that under no circumstances can violent reactions be justified. Exchanges, education and dialogue that promote peaceful and lawful expressions of anger over grievances, that build mutual respect, trust and confidence on the basis of shared responsibility and international law and standards and that contribute to peace and security should be encouraged and sustained.
12. We are alarmed by the deterioration of the economic situation in many parts of the world, which threatens the cohesion of many societies by generating forms of exclusion likely to fuel social tensions and manifestations of xenophobia.
13. We stress that the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions presuppose the recognition of equal dignity of and respect for all cultures, including the cultures of persons belonging to minorities and indigenous peoples.
14. We affirm that indigenous peoples are full-fledged and equal members of our societies. We are deeply concerned that indigenous peoples, especially indigenous women, are particularly susceptible to political, economic and social marginalization, intolerance and prejudice, which undermine their representation and participation in decisions affecting their well-being, advancement and contributions to society.
15. We also affirm that gender equality and respect for diversity are fundamentally linked and we deplore the fact that women belonging to racial, religious, linguistic, cultural and ethnic minorities are particularly vulnerable to political, economic and social alienation and discrimination. Recalling UN Security Council resolution 1325, the 1995 Beijing Declaration issued by the Fourth World Conference on Women, and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women we recognize the role that women can play in promoting mutual understanding, tolerance and peaceful relations in diverse societies as equal decision-makers and participants in the political sphere in order to build more stable, inclusive and equitable societies. We emphasize that non-discriminatory and affirmative action measures are needed not only to pave the way to women's full participation but also to empower them in order to achieve such goals.
16. As parliamentarians, we are mindful that representation in and access to institutions of authority and decision-making positions – both in the public and private spheres – and opportunities for effective political, economic and social participation are important elements of inclusion, tolerance, mutual respect and stability in diverse societies. These are enhanced through respect for and fulfilment of international human rights obligations and commitments, inter alia by:
 - holding free and fair elections with universal and equal voting rights for all citizens;
 - upholding the rule of law, respecting the equality of all persons before the law and their entitlement to the equal protection of the law;
 - ensuring freedom of thought, conscience and religion, freedom of expression, including freedom of the media, and freedom of association, which are necessary to promote an active and engaged civil society and a network of global citizens;
 - guaranteeing all persons full respect of their civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights;
 - explicitly prohibiting discrimination of any kind; and
 - providing a legal framework that enshrines and protects these rights and values.

17. Intercultural dialogue, as a process that comprises an open and respectful exchange between individuals and groups with different ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic backgrounds and heritage, plays an important role in enhancing knowledge and awareness of differences and commonalities among groups, leading to acceptance of diversity as a source of enrichment, tolerance and inclusiveness. In this context, we stress the importance of justice and dialogue in societies emerging from crisis and conflict in order to promote reconciliation and peaceful co-existence with due recognition of national sovereignty.
18. Citizenship affords persons opportunities for participating in political and decision-making processes. It is thus instrumental in protecting vulnerable members of diverse societies. It is also an important tool by which disparate elements in a State can share a civic identity that exists simultaneously with, not at the expense of, other identities. Accordingly, statelessness must be reduced and prevented with the assistance of the international community. In particular, solutions for stateless peoples, including persons of indigenous origin and migrant children, need to be found in accordance with national laws.
19. Interactions with the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government are vital to fostering the inclusion, representation and participation of members of diversity groups. In this context, legislation and policies governing the language(s) of such interactions can contribute to respect for diversity. Accessible and effective development and training in official language(s) will also be beneficial. Moreover, persons belonging to linguistic minorities should not be denied the right to use their own language or to gain access to minority-language education.
20. Non-discriminatory access to quality education and training is necessary to promote knowledge about civic rights and duties and awareness and tolerance of other cultures and civilizations, thereby facilitating political, economic and social participation and inclusiveness of marginalized groups. Youth who might otherwise be susceptible to alienation, radicalization and extremist ideologies benefit particularly from these measures and are more likely to contribute politically, economically and socially to society at large.
21. Natural resources are vital to the prosperity of society. In countries with a diverse population, the development of these resources must take duly into account the diversity of values and beliefs of all societal groups, in particular those of indigenous peoples and local communities, thus recognizing the importance of natural resources and ancestral lands to their identity. Accordingly, natural resource development must be managed responsibly in order to ensure that the traditions and interests of these groups are preserved for future generations.

The role of Parliaments in protecting diversity at the national level

22. We call on our parliaments and their members to use all means available to them to protect and celebrate diversity within and among their societies as a global value. These means include, but are not limited to, effective measures to:
 - (a) adopt and implement international conventions outlining basic human rights, civil, economic and social rights as well as applicable instruments that recognize and promote efforts to maintain cultural differences and provide special rights to ethnic or linguistic minorities, such as promoting their cultures and the use of their languages in education and through the media;
 - (b) enact legislation and adopt political measures designed to strengthen acceptance of diversity among members of different social communities and to nurture understanding, tolerance, mutual respect and friendship among human beings;
 - (c) adopt and implement laws, in particular in the area of civil rights, that provide for and enhance the effective participation of diverse groups in decision-making processes, including in parliament;
 - (d) prevent, combat and eliminate discrimination; repeal any existing discriminatory laws; and enact legislation to counter the dissemination, in the media and via the Internet, of hate messages;
 - (e) heighten public awareness of the role of parliaments in dealing with cultural diversity governance at the national level, notably by celebrating the UN International Day for Diversity (21 May), participating in the UN World Faith Harmony Week (first week of February) or participating in the global campaign "Do one thing for Diversity;"

- (f) promote policies and legislation that favour diversity as a driving force for innovation, prosperity and development at the local and national levels;
 - (g) promote policies and legislation that protect and guarantee respect for the full and equal enjoyment of fundamental human rights and freedoms by all members of society;
 - (h) ensure that the national legal framework provides effective access to legal protection and remedies for individuals experiencing discrimination;
 - (i) ensure access to justice and strengthen the independence and impartiality of the judiciary, which is entrusted with enforcing and ensuring respect for the legal protections related to non-discrimination; and
 - (j) mainstream a gender perspective into all of the above-mentioned measures and, in particular, strengthen the representation of women in parliament.
23. We urge our parliaments to promote the education of children and youth in diversity and plurality in society.
24. We also call on our parliaments to take effective action in the area of intercultural dialogue, namely to:
- (a) establish and support intercultural dialogue and cooperation involving governments, parliaments and parliamentarians, civil society and groups representing society's diversity, to increase awareness of the new challenges, expectations and concerns of a culturally diverse population, notably by organizing annual public hearings to encourage active public participation;
 - (b) adopt and implement national legislation, policies or strategies for intercultural dialogue as part of a framework that integrates different policy fields, namely: education, youth and sports programmes, and media and culture, which inter alia provide the basis for understanding and respecting diversity, facilitate practical experience with intercultural dialogue, connect different value systems and challenge established views; and
 - (c) engage and consult with civil society and groups representing cultural, religious, racial, ethnic and linguistic diversity when developing legislation and policies that are of direct concern to them.

The role of Parliaments in international efforts to protect diversity

25. We emphasize the contribution of parliaments to the peaceful co-existence of ethnic, cultural, racial, linguistic and religious groups, minorities, local communities and indigenous peoples and to international reconciliation.
26. We recall the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expression, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and other regional and international instruments that recognize and establish standards for the exercise and enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the civil, economic, political, social and cultural spheres.
27. We urge our parliaments to encourage States that have not yet done so to ratify and sign international and regional agreements that aim to combat incitement to acts of violence, discrimination and hatred, and to propose international parliamentary initiatives in cooperation with the United Nations to promote this Declaration.
28. We support the efforts of States, relevant bodies within the UN system, other intergovernmental organizations, parliaments and inter-parliamentary organizations, civil society and the media to develop a culture of peace and promote understanding and tolerance among human beings.

- We encourage them to pursue such efforts, including by promoting interfaith and intercultural interaction within and among societies inter alia through congresses, conferences, seminars, workshops, research work.
29. We reiterate our commitment to the 2005 UN World Summit Outcome, which acknowledges the importance of respect and understanding of religious and cultural diversity throughout the world. We commend the work of the UN Alliance of Civilizations in improving understanding and cooperative relations among nations and peoples across cultures and religions, and helping to counter the forces that fuel polarization and extremism.
 30. We reaffirm our support for the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, which entered into force on 18 March 2007, and invite national parliaments and parliamentarians to take an active part in the programmes of the United Nations and UNESCO on dialogue among civilizations and cultures and to encourage their governments to contribute to such programmes.
 31. We recall the International Year for the Rapprochement of Cultures proclaimed in 2010 by the UN General Assembly and consider it an important vehicle for promoting mutual awareness and understanding and celebrating the diversity of societies and civilizations.
 32. We call on international and regional organizations, inter-parliamentary associations, States and national parliaments to develop tools that enable legislation to protect the rights of indigenous peoples and minorities. We commend the joint efforts of the Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, the UNDP, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the IPU in developing a Handbook on the implementation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. We encourage parliaments and States to consult the Handbook for practical ideas and good practices related to improving the situation of indigenous peoples and parliaments throughout the world.
 33. We reaffirm the significant role of the IPU in working towards peace and cooperation among peoples, enhancing interaction between societies and peoples and promoting dialogue among different civilizations and cultures.
 34. We recall our commitments as affirmed in the following resolutions: Migration and development, adopted at the 113th IPU Assembly (Geneva, 2005), Ensuring respect for and peaceful co-existence between all religious communities and beliefs in a globalized world, adopted at the 116th IPU Assembly (Nusa Dua, 2007), Promoting diversity and equal rights for all through universal democratic and electoral standards, adopted at the 116th IPU Assembly (Nusa Dua, 2007), Migrant workers, people trafficking, xenophobia and human rights, adopted at the 118th IPU Assembly (Cape Town, 2008) and the Chiapas Declaration, adopted at the International Parliamentary Conference on Parliaments, minorities and indigenous peoples: Effective participation in politics (Chiapas, Mexico, 2010).
 35. We call on the IPU to strengthen its relationship with the UN Alliance of Civilizations and strengthen its role in fostering inter-parliamentary exchange of information and experience in respect of the implementation of effective measures concerning the protection of diversity within and across civilizations.
 36. We also call on the IPU and the UN Alliance of Civilizations, as well as any other relevant partners, to share information on national approaches, policies and strategies on intercultural dialogue and national legal frameworks upon which intercultural dialogue and cooperation depend.
 37. We urge our parliaments and parliamentarians to strengthen parliamentary dialogue among civilizations and cultures, within the framework of the IPU and the various inter-parliamentary assemblies they participate in, and through bilateral initiatives such as the establishment of inter-parliamentary friendship groups.
 38. We recommend that the IPU and national parliaments, the United Nations, UNESCO and other relevant organizations, collaborate to implement the provisions of this Declaration.

PLAN OF ACTION FOR GENDER-SENSITIVE PARLIAMENTS**Adopted by the 127th IPU Assembly
(Québec City, 26 October 2012)**

The 127th IPU Assembly,

Having before it the Plan of Action for Gender-sensitive Parliaments,

Considering that the document was drawn up following an extensive process of consultation with IPU Members,

Mindful that the document resulting from this process proposes concrete solutions to situations common to all countries while offering a wide range of options responding to individual situations – national and regional – and that it represents a common basis for the advancement of gender-sensitive parliaments in all countries,

1. Decides to adopt the Plan of Action for Gender-sensitive Parliaments;
2. Strongly encourages Members to bring this Plan of Action to the attention of their parliaments and governments, disseminate it as widely as possible and implement it at the national level;
3. Requests the IPU Secretary General to ensure that this document is circulated as widely as possible at the international level and to promote its implementation at the national level.

Preamble

Democracy requires constant evaluation and reassessment. In the 20th century, one of the greatest changes to democracy around the world was the inclusion of increasing numbers of women, both as voters and as members of parliament.

In parallel, gender equality and women's empowerment have become an integral part of the international political and development agenda, recognized as being at the heart of progress towards, and achievement of, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Gender equality means that women and men enjoy full and equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities. Gender equality and women's empowerment are human rights, requiring political and legal expression. Countries must promote, respect and protect women's human rights, including gender equality.

Progress towards these goals requires direct action. While specific actions may need to take into account the individual cultural, social and religious context of parliaments around the world, progress essentially requires a widespread change in attitudes and perceptions.

Parliaments are well placed to champion the goal of gender equality. Parliaments aim to reflect society, and so they must reflect the changing dynamics of their electorates.

A gender-sensitive parliament is a parliament that responds to the needs and interests of both men and women in its composition, structures, operations, methods and work. Gender-sensitive parliaments remove the barriers to women's full participation and offer a positive example or model to society at large. They ensure that their operations and resources are used effectively towards promoting gender equality.

A gender-sensitive parliament is one in which there are no barriers – substantive, structural or cultural – to women's full participation and to equality between its men and women members and staff. It is not only a place where women can work, but also one where women want to work and contribute. A gender-sensitive parliament sets a positive example by promoting gender equality and women's empowerment among society both nationally and internationally.

A gender-sensitive parliament is therefore a modern parliament; one that addresses and reflects the equality demands of a modern society. Ultimately, it is a parliament that is more efficient, effective and legitimate.

Objectives

This Plan of Action is designed to support parliaments in their efforts to become more gender-sensitive. It presents a broad range of strategies in seven action areas that can be implemented by all parliaments, irrespective of the number of women members.

Parliaments are called upon to take ownership of this Plan of Action and to implement any or all of the Plan's strategies at the national level by setting concrete objectives, actions and deadlines suited to their national context. They are also called upon to regularly monitor and evaluate their progress towards the goal of gender sensitivity.

A gender-sensitive parliament responds to the needs and interests of both men and women in its structures, operations, methods and work.

A gender-sensitive parliament is one that:

1. promotes and achieves equality in numbers of women and men across all of its bodies and internal structures.
2. develops a gender equality policy framework suited to its own national parliamentary context.
3. mainstreams gender equality throughout all of its work.
4. fosters an internal culture that respects women's rights, promotes gender equality and responds to the needs and realities of MPs – men and women – to balance work and family responsibilities.
5. acknowledges and builds on the contribution made by its men members who pursue and advocate for gender equality.
6. encourages political parties to take a proactive role in the promotion and achievement of gender equality.
7. equips its parliamentary staff with the capacity and resources to promote gender equality, actively encourages the recruitment and retention of women to senior positions, and ensures that gender equality is mainstreamed throughout the work of the parliamentary administration.

Key action areas of the Plan

Action area 1: Increase the number of women in parliament and achieve equality in participation

Equality of participation can be both a catalyst for implementing gender-sensitive changes and an important outcome of successful gender-sensitive changes.

a. Access to parliament

While the representation of women in parliaments has increased slowly since the mid-twentieth century, it still does not match women's broader representation in society.

Increasing access to parliament through gender-sensitive changes will help increase the number of women parliamentarians, which can in turn prompt the further implementation of the principles of gender sensitivity.

To redress this imbalance, parliaments should implement one or more of the following measures:

- In line with their national context, adopt special measures to ensure that higher numbers of women are selected by parties to run in "winnable" seats, and propose amendments to electoral laws and national constitutions that provide for reserved seats.
- Condemn acts of violence against women candidates and parliamentarians and adopt legal and practical measures to prevent and punish such acts.

- Conduct awareness-raising campaigns on the importance of women's representation in parliament.
- Support mentorship programmes and promote women parliamentarians as role models through parliament's communications tools and in the media.
- Facilitate the sharing of experiences and best practices among parliamentarians through study tours to other parliaments in the region and internationally.

b. Achieving equality in positions and roles

While the number of women in parliament is important, it is equally important to have women in positions of parliamentary leadership.

The principles of gender-sensitive parliaments can be advanced if women occupy leadership positions as parliamentarians and as key members of parliamentary staff, as they are then in a position to influence policy directions, change parliamentary procedure and practices, serve as role models to other women and provide a different perspective in debates.

To improve the leadership status of women and achieve greater gender equality in leadership positions, parliaments should implement one or more of the following measures:

- Adopt affirmative action measures and amend the internal rules so as to give preference to women over men for parliamentary positions (including committee chairs and leadership positions in the Bureau or Board) in cases where qualifications are equal or commensurate with their representation in the parliament.
- Rotate positions of parliamentary leadership between men and women over a period of time.
- Introduce dual leadership for parliamentary structures, where possible, through the appointment of a man and a woman.
- Encourage the proportional and equitable distribution of women parliamentarians across all committees, not just those relating to women, children, gender, families, health and education.
- Encourage persons in leadership positions to broaden the criteria used to evaluate the relevance of women's and men's experience before entering politics.

Action area 2: Strengthen gender equality legislation and policy

Parliaments can become more gender-sensitive by implementing legislation and policies that support the principles of gender equality. The introduction of gender equality and gender mainstreaming legislation can be an effective catalyst for social and cultural change in attitudes towards gender equality.

Parliaments can also serve as a model for society by championing gender equality through the implementation of gender-sensitive strategic policies, action plans and operational and supporting policies.

a. National legislation

With the goal of promoting change in social and cultural attitudes towards gender equality, parliaments should:

- enact laws that promote and protect gender equality; where gender equality laws were enacted but have become outdated or were enacted more than 10 years ago, parliaments should review such legislation to include gender mainstreaming frameworks and mechanisms for monitoring and enforcing implementation.

With the aim of guaranteeing a legislative mandate for gender mainstreaming, parliaments should:

- consider introducing a law and/or mechanisms that require all government policy and legislation to be reviewed and assessed for their gender impact and compliance with the State's obligations under relevant international conventions, including the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic and Social Rights.

b. Parliament's strategic policies and action plans

In order to serve as leaders and role models for championing gender equality in society, parliaments should:

- Develop a gender equality policy that sets out:
 - the rationale and strategic direction for implementing measures contained in this Plan of Action,
 - concrete actions the parliament will take to address gender equality within a specific timeframe, and
 - indicators to measure progress that are monitored regularly through an appropriate parliamentary oversight mechanism.
- Ensure that the parliament's budget is gender-sensitive and that accountability measures are in place to monitor progress.

c. Operational and supporting policies of the parliament**i. Develop media and communications policies**

To ensure that the importance of promoting gender equality is well understood and given the utmost visibility, parliament should:

- develop a gender communications strategy that identifies target audiences, key messages, methods and timeframes.
- showcase and publicize their gender equality activities and outcomes in the media, or through the parliament's own communication channels, including its website.

ii. Develop anti-harassment and anti-discrimination policies

To ensure that all parliamentarians and parliamentary staff work in an environment free from all forms of discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment, parliament should:

- introduce a code of conduct that requires all parliamentarians to be respectful and courteous and penalizes any language and behaviour that is considered sexist.
- develop and implement anti-discrimination and anti-harassment policies in line with national legislation applicable to all parliamentarians and parliamentary staff including the establishment of an independent body to which complaints can be submitted and addressed.
- ensure that the language used in all official documents, including standing orders, is gender-sensitive (e.g. does not refer to members using the masculine pronoun "he" and uses Chairperson or Chair rather than Chairman).

Action area 3: Mainstream gender equality throughout all parliamentary work

Gender inequality can be tackled effectively only if policies in all areas are designed in such a way as to address the specific concerns, needs and constraints of both women and men while building on their respective capacities and contributions.

The mainstreaming of gender considerations in a parliament's work is an effective gender-sensitive change as gender mainstreaming is a process that recognizes the economic, social, political and legal differences that exist between women and men.

a. Committing to gender mainstreaming

Parliaments should demonstrate their commitment to gender mainstreaming by showcasing and creating opportunities to incorporate a gender dimension in all areas of their work. In this respect, they should:

- foster debates on legislation and budgets, including the implications of such bills and expenditure allocations for women and men, girls and boys (e.g. allocate time or hold a special session to debate the allocations and expenditure for gender equality in the budget).
- develop clear gender-based legislative assessment guidelines or toolkits (e.g. a gender-based checklist for all pieces of legislation, including the budget).

- allocate time in the order of business for special debates on gender equality or gender-specific questioning of ministers, in which both men and women are encouraged to participate.
- ensure that committees investigating gender equality concerns have sufficient time and resources (including staff with gender expertise) to fulfil their mandate, an opportunity to report back to the plenary on their work and recommendations as well as the same powers and responsibilities as any other parliamentary committee (e.g. call for written evidence, hear from witnesses and ministers and report on findings and recommendations).
- ensure that there is a formal mechanism by which the body that is tasked with gender mainstreaming – be it an informal women’s caucus or a dedicated parliamentary committee – can report on its studies and examination of legislation to the key political organs of the parliament. Where reports have not been presented, reasons should be given.

b. Establishing gender mainstreaming structures and mechanisms

Gender mainstreaming involves, in part, the following activities: obtaining gender-disaggregated data and qualitative information on the situation of men and women; conducting a gender analysis which highlights the differences between and among women, men, girls and boys in terms of their relative distribution of resources, opportunities, constraints and power in a given context; and instituting gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, including the establishment of indicators to gauge the extent to which gender equality objectives are met and changes in gender relations are achieved.

Parliaments should adopt one or more of the following mechanisms that are best suited to their own context:

- A dedicated parliamentary committee on gender equality entrusted with reviewing government policies, legislation and budgets from a gender perspective, where committee members question a broad range of groups and individuals, including public agencies, academics and private organizations, about their views on the effectiveness of government programmes and activities, and where strong links are forged between the committee and national women’s machineries, civil society organizations (CSOs), research institutes and universities.
- Mainstreaming gender throughout all parliamentary committees, so that all committee members – men and women – are mandated to address the gender implications of the policy, legislative and budgetary matters under their consideration as appropriate, supported by parliamentary research staff with gender expertise.
- A women’s parliamentary caucus with a special remit for gender equality concerns, composed of women (and men, if desired) working on a commonly agreed agenda. An effective caucus relies on strong links with national women’s machineries, CSOs and research institutes and universities.
- A Speaker’s reference group on gender equality composed of men and women parliamentarians from across the political spectrum, which reports to the Speaker directly and sets the parliament’s gender equality direction and agenda;
- Technical research units on gender equality or library/research staff with gender expertise who have access to up-to-date information, books, computers and online databases and who can assist with gender-based analyses.

Action area 4: Institute or improve gender-sensitive infrastructure and parliamentary culture

Parliaments are like any other workplace, and as such, should serve as a model for society by upholding the principles of gender sensitivity through the provision of family-friendly policies and infrastructure, and the implementation of policies related to the prevention of discrimination and harassment, and policies on the equitable distribution of parliamentary resources and facilities.

a. Facilitating a work-family balance

To ensure that workplace policies and infrastructure reflect the contemporary work and family realities facing men and women parliamentarians, and in recognition of the fact that women worldwide continue to spend a disproportionate amount of time on care-giving, parliaments should:

- rearrange their sitting hours (e.g. by establishing compressed sitting weeks, creating schedules that start early, avoiding late voting, and aligning sitting times with the school calendar) so that parliamentarians can return to their electorates and spend more time with their families.
- allocate space in the parliamentary building for a childcare centre and a family room so that parliamentarians can be close to their children during sittings.
- ensure that parliamentarians – both men and women – are entitled to parental leave on the birth of their children.
- consider alternatives where long-term parental leave cannot be implemented, such as accepting parental leave as a legitimate reason for missing a sitting day, in addition to that of "official business".
- give parliamentarians who are still breastfeeding the opportunity to use a proxy vote or vote pairing so that they need not attend the sitting.

b. Fostering a work culture free of discrimination and harassment

To ensure a safe, respectful, non-discriminatory and harassment-free workplace, parliaments should:

- conduct a gender-based analysis of parliamentary rituals, dress codes, forms of address and commonly used language, conventions and rules.
- provide gender-awareness training seminars for all members of parliament and ensure that induction for new members is gender-sensitive. This could take the form of mentoring for new women parliamentarians, pairing women with experienced parliamentarians (men or women) or presentations by senior women parliamentarians on strategies to cope in the parliamentary environment.

c. Providing equitable resources and facilities

To ensure that the parliamentary precinct facilities are suited to the needs of men and women and that resources are equitably distributed, parliaments should:

- conduct a gender assessment of the facilities provided to all parliamentarians.
- ensure that allowances and parliamentary travel entitlements are provided to parliamentarians equitably and transparently and that parliamentary delegations are gender-balanced, when possible.

Action area 5: Ensure that responsibility for gender equality is shared by all parliamentarians – men and women

The realization of a gender-sensitive parliament, based on the ultimate goal of gender equality in all its structures, methods and work, will not take place without the support and involvement of men parliamentarians. Changing social values and heightening gender awareness among men have resulted in stronger partnerships between men and women on gender equality.

Parliaments should adopt strategies that promote such partnerships, including by:

- promoting the co-sponsorship of gender equality legislation by a man and a woman parliamentarian.
- appointing a man and a woman parliamentarian as co-chairs and/or vice-chairs of a gender equality committee.
- establishing committee inquiries into gender policy issues of interest to men.
- encouraging the inclusion of men in parliamentary events pertaining to the recognition of gender-related issues, such as International Women's Day and the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women.
- ensuring gender balance on study tours and in international delegations on gender equality or gender mainstreaming.
- providing gender-sensitive training programmes for men parliamentarians.

Action area 6: Encourage political parties to be champions of gender equality

Political parties are often the dominant form of political organization and the mechanism through which women and men pursue a legislative agenda with respect to the achievement of gender equality.

Parliaments should encourage political parties to adopt the following gender-sensitive measures:

a. Increase the number of women in their ranks by:

- Considering special temporary measures to promote the entry and retention of women in parliament.
- Promoting men and women equally to all leadership positions in their executive bodies.
- Endorsing training and mentoring schemes that pair elected parliamentarians with eligible women interested in running for election, including courses on various aspects of election campaigns and training in media relations.
- Establishing support networks for women candidates at elections and for elected women with the goal of improving both recruitment and retention rates.

b. Institute gender-sensitive meeting arrangements and work practices by:

- Setting meeting times that do not coincide with other family responsibilities.
- Respecting the expected duration of meetings so that other family commitments can be kept.

c. Develop gender mainstreaming mechanisms by:

- Developing an overarching gender equality plan with clear gender mainstreaming strategies and dedicated party committees to oversee, monitor and evaluate their implementation.
- Encouraging political parties to use gender-sensitive language in their documents.

d. Equitably allocate parliamentary committee positions among men and women by:

- Encouraging parties to adopt a transparent method of appointing members to committees and to leadership positions on those committees in a way that better matches members' diverse abilities, work experience and preferences regarding committee assignments. Parties could also give preference to women over men in cases where qualifications are equal.

Action area 7: Enhance the gender sensitivity of, and gender equality among, parliamentary staff

Gender-sensitive parliaments are champions of gender equality, not only for their members, but also for the many staff who support them. Parliamentary administrations need to review their workplace culture and infrastructure, and act to ensure that all staff are able to support parliament in achieving its gender equality goals. In this respect, parliaments and their administration should:

- Develop and implement anti-discrimination and anti-harassment policies applicable for all parliamentary staff, including the establishment of an independent body to which complaints can be submitted and addressed.
- Assess the number and seniority of women in the parliamentary administration.
- Establish a committee or entrust an existing one with the task of examining the possible implementation of affirmative action policies that give preference to women over men for parliamentary positions in cases where qualifications are equal and where women are inadequately represented at leadership levels.
- Provide gender awareness training seminars for all parliamentary staff to explain the principles of gender equality and why a gender-sensitive parliament benefits everyone.
- Build the capacity of parliamentary staff to conduct gender-based analyses of legislation, budgets and policies.

Implementation of this Plan of Action

Initiate and implement gender-sensitive reform in parliament

Gender sensitivity is a goal towards which all parliaments must strive. To achieve this goal, parliaments should design a process suited to their national situations that should include the following core elements:

a. Evaluation

Parliaments interested in evaluating their level of gender sensitivity should:

- Use the IPU's gender-sensitive self-assessment toolkit. The purpose of the self-assessment is not to rank parliaments but rather to help parliaments identify their strengths and weaknesses against international best practices. The toolkit provides a framework for discussion among members of parliament. The method involves answering questions about the way gender equality is incorporated into the culture and work of the parliament.
- Use their own internal structures to evaluate their level of gender sensitivity, such as an audit, or other business review or committee. In this case, external stakeholders such as civil society groups, national women's machineries and research institutes could be invited to share their opinions on the state of gender sensitivity with the committee, and draw up recommendations for change. The committee would then present its own conclusions and recommendations to the plenary or parliamentary leadership for discussion and further action.

b. Implementation

Irrespective of the method used, it is vital that parliaments reflect on the importance of gender equality and the way they promote this goal not only to their electorates, but also to their members.

Taking stock is a first step, after which parliaments can draw up and implement a roadmap for reform with concrete objectives, actions and deadlines suited to their national context. For this they will need to secure resources.

c. Monitoring

Parliaments should identify a structure entrusted specifically with monitoring implementation of the Plan of Action for Gender-sensitive Parliaments and efforts to achieve the goal of gender sensitivity.

d. Promotion

Parliaments should give visibility to the reforms undertaken and the results achieved.

Parliaments should take action at the international level to promote the principle of gender equality in all international parliamentary institutions and encourage women's equal participation therein.

Political will and commitment are essential to achieve all of this.

The role of the IPU in supporting gender-sensitive parliaments

For the past 30 years, the IPU has demonstrated its commitment to high-quality and action-oriented research on gender and parliament. The IPU is singularly placed to support its Member Parliaments in their efforts to become gender-sensitive, and through this Plan, undertakes to:

a. Take the lead role in promoting gender-sensitive parliaments by:

- Ensuring high-level commitment to the Plan among Members and regular follow-up of the Plan at its Assemblies.
- Giving visibility to the Plan, including through its website, its Gender Partnership Programme and technical assistance activities.
- Supporting all national parliaments in conducting a gender-sensitive self-assessment by 2030.
- Encouraging parliaments to draw up action plans and establish monitoring mechanisms aimed at strengthening the implementation of parliamentary action plans.
- Strengthening cooperation on the promotion of a gender-sensitive parliament with regional partner organizations and relevant international organizations.

b. Build in-house capacity on gender equality and gender mainstreaming by:

- Implementing a gender mainstreaming strategy.
- Ensuring that professional development training for all IPU staff is gender-sensitive.
- Committing to mainstreaming gender equality throughout the Secretariat's work.

c. Place gender equality issues systematically on the agenda of discussions with Member Parliaments, partner organizations and regional parliamentary organizations by:

- Entrusting the Gender Partnership Group with responsibility for regularly monitoring the gender sensitivity of parliaments.
- Ensuring that gender is mainstreamed in all technical assistance activities.
- Promoting its work on gender-sensitive parliaments in all international forums.

ANNEX 1: Basic definitions

Gender*: the social attributes associated with being male and female and the relationships between women, men, girls and boys. These attributes and relationships are socially constructed and are learned through socialization. The concept of gender also includes expectations about the characteristics, aptitudes and likely behaviours of both women and men, and when applied to social analysis, reveals socially constructed roles. Sex and gender do not mean the same thing. While sex refers to biological differences, gender refers to social differences, which can be modified since gender identity, roles and relations are determined by society.

Gender mainstreaming*: the process of assessing and taking into account the implications for women and men of any planned action – including legislation, policies or programmes – at all levels and in all spheres. The concept is understood as strategies that put gender issues at the centre of broad policy and programme decisions, institutional structures and resource allocation. Mainstreaming gender equality into the work of parliament should contribute to effective implementation and oversight of policies that address the needs and interests of both men and women.

Gender-sensitive parliament*: a parliament that responds to the needs and interests of both men and women in its structures, operations, methods and work. Gender-sensitive parliaments remove the barriers to women's full participation and offer a positive example or model to society at large.

Gender-sensitive budgeting*: an approach that aims to mainstream gender in economic policy-making and seeks to transform the entire budgetary process. Gender budgeting refers not only to expenditures earmarked for women, but also to an analysis of the entire budget from a gender perspective, including security, health, education, public works, etc. in order to ensure that the allocations and resulting impacts respond to the needs of both women and men.

Gender-Based Violence:** Acts of physical, mental or social abuse (including sexual violence) that are attempted or threatened, with some type of force (such as violence, threats, coercion, manipulation, deception, cultural expectations, weapons or economic circumstances) and directed against a person because of his or her gender roles and expectations in a society or culture. A person facing gender-based violence has no choice: he/she cannot refuse or pursue other options without serious social, physical, or psychological consequences. Forms include sexual violence, sexual abuse, sexual harassment, sexual exploitation, early marriage or forced marriage, gender discrimination, denial (e.g. of education, food and freedom) and female genital mutilation.

* Definitions are taken from UN/OSAGI, UNDP and UNESCO as quoted in UNDP, Quick Entry Points to Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality in Democratic Governance Clusters, New York, 2007 and the IPU, Equality in Politics: A Survey of Women and Men in Parliaments, Geneva, 2008.

** The definition is adapted from UN WOMEN, Virtual Knowledge Centre to End Violence against Women and Girls, last accessed on 19.09.2010: <http://www.endvawnow.org/en/articles/347-glossary-of-terms-from-programming-essentials-and-monitoring-and-evaluation-sections.html>.

REPORT OF THE IPU COMMITTEE ON UNITED NATIONS AFFAIRS**Noted by the 127th IPU Assembly
(Québec City, 26 October 2012)**

The IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs met from 22 to 26 October in Québec City, Canada, during the 127th IPU Assembly. The United Nations General Assembly resolution on interaction between the United Nations, national parliaments and the Inter-Parliamentary Union (resolution A/66/261, adopted by consensus in May 2012) provided the background to the meeting, along with a number of recent UN processes.

The Committee's first sitting took the form of a round-table discussion on Multilateralism and the role of parliamentary diplomacy. The round table brought together representatives from regional parliamentary bodies involved in various ways in international efforts to promote national reconciliation, peace-building and conflict prevention. It provided a unique opportunity for the participants to share information and experiences, and to identify the means of making parliamentary diplomacy more coherent and effective.

During the round table, the participants discussed the various aspects of parliamentary diplomacy and its limitations in practice. The limitations include the fact that in many countries foreign policy is traditionally considered to be the prerogative of the executive branch, and parliaments often lack capacity in this domain. It is clear that parliamentary diplomacy will gain ground and recognition only if it brings to the table more innovative thinking or if it complements official diplomatic action. Similarly, parliamentary diplomacy must be made more accountable to citizens and taxpayers, and focus more on results.

The participants found that parliamentary diplomacy is not just about the resolution of disputes but also about conflict prevention. The soft diplomacy that parliaments are best equipped to carry out can help build trust between countries, shed light on different cultural perspectives, or simply convey information that is not normally available through official channels. Another advantage of parliamentary diplomacy is that it can help ensure continuity in multilateral relations in the face of frequent changes at the helm of government. A common approach on the ground is election monitoring, in which outside parliamentary observers from other countries can help diffuse tensions.

At the same time, however, several participants found that the current proliferation of parliamentary assemblies or associations is not problem-free, in particular given the growing overlap in terms of catchment areas and political terms of reference, which needs to be addressed. Regional parliamentary bodies, which are rooted in local cultures, are often best placed to address local disputes. The direct relationship between global and regional parliamentary efforts needs to be strengthened. The sitting therefore concluded that further discussion was required, and that the IPU should take the lead by carrying out a study on existing good practices and convening further consultations with the regional parliamentary organizations, the United Nations and other partners.

To mark United Nations Day (24 October), the Committee's second sitting took the form of a debate on the question Does the United Nations take democracy seriously enough? The sitting touched on a number of areas in which the UN and the IPU are working together, in particular the rule of law, integrity of elections, and the promotion of good governance and greater transparency in the work of parliaments.

The Committee considered the matter from the perspectives of both the UN inter-governmental process and UN field operations. In terms of the UN political agenda, the concept of democracy lacks a universally agreed definition, and as such it does not figure prominently on the General Assembly agenda. The UN decision-making process continues to be flawed, with the voices of the few often prevailing over those of the many. This is particularly in evidence at the Security Council, where reform of membership and veto rights is as urgently required as ever. When it comes to UN assistance for emerging democracies or fragile States, a fairly uneven picture emerges, ranging from almost unmitigated success in the case of Timor-Leste to disappointment in Haiti.

Admittedly, since the 2000 Millennium Declaration, UN member States have pledged to uphold some of the main principles of democracy, but more needs to be done to articulate those principles and put them into practice. This contrasts, for example, with the UN's strong investment in development following the establishment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). On the other hand, the UN has made great strides forward on democracy-related subjects such as human rights and the empowerment of women, with the establishment respectively of the new Human Rights Council and UN Women.

Another recent development was the adoption of the UN Declaration on the Rule of Law, which enshrines the principles of this key pillar of democracy for the first time. The Declaration also formally acknowledges the role of parliaments and of the IPU in support of the rule of law, thus setting the stage for greater cooperation between the two organizations in this area. In this connection, the participants noted the publication of *The Rule of Law - A Guide for Politicians*.

The discussion on the rule of law was followed by a more expansive debate on the importance of free and fair elections as a necessary, although insufficient, condition of democracy. A report by the International Institute for Democracy and Election Assistance (International IDEA) on electoral violence brought home the point that honest and transparent elections foster greater political accountability, support development and contribute to political stability.

In addition, the Committee heard a presentation by the National Democratic Institute (NDI), the Sunlight Foundation and the Latin American Network for Legislative Transparency on the recently adopted Declaration on Parliamentary Openness. The Declaration is a distillation of the work conducted by parliamentary monitoring organizations on how parliaments ought to become more transparent and accessible to the public as a way of further developing a culture of democracy. As the Declaration affirms, the information that a parliament produces belongs to the citizens that it seeks to represent.

The Committee underscored that democracy remains a work in progress for virtually all States, and that it takes much more than the work of the UN to bring it to fruition. Ultimately, democracy requires a supportive culture that must be constantly nurtured at the national level. Parliamentarians play a pivotal role in this respect, as representatives of citizens and civil society as a whole. Likewise, parliamentarians can do a great deal more to influence the position of governments and give greater prominence to democracy at the UN.

To mark UN Day, the Committee also launched the latest [IPU Handbook for parliamentarians on supporting nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament](#). The Handbook builds on the work conducted in the years following the adoption in 2009 of the landmark IPU resolution entitled *Advancing nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament and securing the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty: The role of parliaments*. It identifies good practices and model legislation in this area, offering a series of recommendations for further parliamentary action. The Handbook is the result of cooperation with Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament (PNND) and the World Future Council, and was made possible thanks to a generous contribution from the Swiss Federal Department of Political Affairs.

The Executive Secretary of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO), the senior adviser to the United Nations High Representative on Disarmament Affairs, the President of the IPU Standing Committee on Peace and International Security and the co-Chair of the PNND Canada Chapter joined the lead authors in presenting the Handbook to the Committee. Several participants, including the Speaker of the parliament of Kazakhstan and prominent legislators from India, New Zealand, Egypt, the Philippines and Costa Rica joined parliamentarians from all regions of the world in calling for determined parliamentary action to make the vision of a nuclear-weapon-free world a palpable reality.

On 25 October, the Committee took stock of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD, also known as Rio+ 20), in a sitting entitled What prospects for sustainable development? The Committee underscored that the UNCSD was a disappointment, as it broke no new ground and led to very few new commitments. This was ascribed mostly to a lack of political will and the inability of governments to tackle certain issues effectively. On the other hand, Rio+ 20 also helped return the whole sustainable development agenda to the top of the international agenda. What counts now is what all stakeholders are willing to do both to implement the Rio outcome and to take it to the next level of commitment.

The Committee agreed that the UNCSD's main achievement was the mandate it gave for the establishment of a new generation of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that will replace the current MDGs in 2015. The SDGs are intended to apply to both developed and developing countries, providing a set of goals that should synthesize the three pillars of sustainability: economic, social and environmental. The Committee deemed it important for the SDGs to have two clear core objectives: eradicating poverty and narrowing inequality. It is also crucial that they be fully owned from the start by all stakeholders, including parliamentarians, civil society and the private sector. Most importantly, the SDGs should come with clear reporting and monitoring mechanisms to assess progress. The main lesson learned from the MDGs is that progress is possible when there is ownership and leadership, and when communities are empowered.

The overarching challenge of the SDGs will be to build bridges between nature and people at a time when the world population is growing and in a context of limited natural resources. The post-Rio agenda must aim at rethinking growth in terms of human well-being and not just material expansion. The Committee also agreed that a human rights perspective will need to be embedded in future discussions about the post-2015 development framework, including the right to food and new rights such as the right to water, which provide useful entry points for pursuing all three pillars of sustainability in an integrated manner. Upholding the right to food implies a discussion of power relations and the concentration of power in a few hands, as reflected in the current wave of land grabbing in many countries around the world. Food security will only be ensured if smallholders, especially women, receive more proactive support.

Going forward, parliaments will have a critical role to play in advancing the post-Rio agenda in tandem with the global process led by the UN. They should play an active part in the new UN Consultative Forum, created in Rio as a multi-stakeholder platform. They should also provide input at an early stage for the new General Assembly Open Working Group on sustainable development goals and the Secretary-General's High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda. The place to begin is at the national level, where the UN is also conducting consultations that will feed into the global intergovernmental process. A good example has been set by Parliament in the United Kingdom, which is already conducting hearings on the new development framework.

The Committee's last sitting examined the progress made and obstacles encountered in the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, five years after its adoption in 2007. The Declaration sets minimum standards for the survival, well-being and dignity of indigenous peoples. The participants noted positive developments, such as the adoption of a national plan of action in the Democratic Republic of the Congo for implementing the Declaration, and the Declaration's incorporation into Bolivian national law. Overall, however, there remains a wide gap between the standards and their implementation.

The participants enquired about good practices for obtaining the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples to legislative and administrative measures affecting them, a principle that is enshrined in the Declaration. Good practices are in fact rare – many States are struggling to engage effectively with indigenous peoples, if they seek to do so at all. This is clearly an issue for parliaments to take up.

The United Nations will convene the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples in September 2014. The preparatory resolution invites stakeholders, including parliamentarians, to participate in this process. The way in which governments will engage with parliaments, indigenous peoples and others in the preparation of the World Conference remains largely to be determined, but parliaments have an opportunity to engage their governments and hold them to account.

Several people noted the low level of participation at this sitting. They underlined that everybody should be concerned by indigenous rights. Indigenous concerns should be shared more broadly, among parliamentarians and in society in general. In the words of an indigenous parliamentarian from New Zealand, the realization of indigenous peoples' rights is "a journey, for indigenous and non-indigenous, hand in hand".

At the close of its annual meeting, the Committee pledged to redouble its efforts to enhance interaction between the United Nations, parliaments and the IPU. This report will be circulated among IPU Member Parliaments and in the broader UN community, with a view to articulating a robust programme of work for the years ahead.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

Mr./M. Noël A. Kinsella

Speaker of the Senate of Canada
Président du Sénat du Canada

Mr./M. Andrew Scheer

Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada
Président de la Chambre des Communes du Canada

Mr./M. Donald H. Oliver

Speaker pro-tempore of the Senate of Canada
Président intérimaire du Sénat du Canada

President of the 127th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union
Président de la 127^{ème} Assemblée de l'Union interparlementaire

Mr./M. Abdelwahad Radi

President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union
Président de l'Union interparlementaire

Mr./M. Anders B. JOHNSON

Secretary General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union
Secrétaire général de l'Union interparlementaire

I. MEMBERS – MEMBRES**AFGHANISTAN**

IBRAHIMI, Abdul Raouf (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the House of Representatives Président de la Chambre des Représentants
MUJADIDI, Fazel Azim Zalmy (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants
BARAKZAI, Shukria (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants
KALAKANI, Daoud (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants
AZIZ, Fatema (Ms./Mme)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants
TAKHARI, Mohammad Yunus (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Elders Membre du Conseil des Anciens
HAMIDY, Farida (Ms./Mme)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants
ZAHIDI, Taiba (Ms./Mme)	Member of the House of Elders Membre du Conseil des Anciens
HASSAN, Qais (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants
WAFI, Ashequllah (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants
NASRAT, Khudai Nazar (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the House of Representatives Secrétaire général de la Chambre des Représentants
AKIFI, Shah Sultan (Mr./M.)	Deputy Secretary General of the House of Elders Secrétaire général adjoint du Conseil des Anciens
AHMADZAI, Shirshah (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group Secrétaire du Groupe	Director, Relations with International Organizations and NGOs, House of Elders / Directeur des relations avec les organisations internationales et les ONG, Conseil des Anciens
FAROOQ, Said Omer (Mr./M.)	Adviser to the Speaker / Conseiller du Président
HUSSAINI, Samiullah (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group Secrétaire du Groupe	Director, Inter-Parliamentary Relations, House of Representatives / Directeur des relations interparlementaires, Chambre des Représentants

ALGERIA – ALGERIE

BOUAHARA, Abderrazak (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Deputy Speaker of the Council of the Nation Vice-Président du Conseil de la Nation
BOUCHOUAREB, Abdesselam (Mr./M.)	Deputy Speaker of the National People's Assembly Vice-Président de l'Assemblée populaire nationale (RND)
DRIF BITAT, Zohra (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the Council of the Nation Membre du Conseil de la Nation
BENAROUS, Zahia (Mrs./Mme) Member of the Committee on Middle East Questions / Membre du Comité sur les questions relatives au Moyen-Orient	Member of the Council of the Nation Membre du Conseil de la Nation (RND)
ATEK MEFTALI, Yamina (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National People's Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée populaire nationale (FLN)

DJELLOUT, Ahmed (Mr./M.)	Member of the National People's Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée populaire nationale (FLN) ¹
AMRANI, Hafnaoui (Mr./M.) Former President of the ASGP Ex-Président de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the Council of the Nation Secrétaire général du Conseil de la Nation
BELKAS, Abdelhamid Badis (Mr./M.)	Secretary General of the National People's Assembly Secrétaire général de l'Assemblée populaire nationale
SIBACHIR, Noureddine (Mr./M.)	Head of Studies, National People's Assembly Chef d'études à l'Assemblée populaire nationale
MAAZOUZ, Amel (Ms./Mme)	Deputy Director, Council of the Nation Sous-Directrice au Conseil de la Nation

ANDORRA – ANDORRE

BONELL, Mònica (Ms./Mme) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Vice-President of the General Council Vice-Présidente du Conseil général (DA)
GONZALEZ, Mariona (Ms./Mme)	Member of the General Council Membre du Conseil général (PS)
MATEU, Meritxell (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the General Council Membre du Conseil général (DA) ²
RODRÍGUEZ, Arantxa (Mrs./Mme) Secretary of the Group and to the delegation Secrétaire du Groupe et de la délégation	

ARGENTINA – ARGENTINE

FILMUS, Daniel (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Senator, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee Sénateur, Président de la Commission des relations extérieures (FV-PJ)
ESCUADERO, Sonia Margarita (Mrs./Mme) Substitute Member of the Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians / Membre suppléant du Comité de coordination des Femmes parlementaires	Senator / Sénatrice (PJ)
GIUSTINIANI, Rubén (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur (PS)
IRRAZABAL, Juan Manuel (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur
GIACCONE, Claudia (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
ATANASOF, Alfredo Néstor (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (FP) ³
CARLOTTO, Remo Gerardo (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
MULLER, Mabel (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
LATORRE, Roxana (Ms./Mme) Adviser / Conseillère	Senator / Sénatrice
VACA NARVAJA, Gustavo Sabino (Mr./M.)	Director, International Relations, Senate Directeur des relations internationales au Sénat

¹ (RND: National Democratic Rally
(FLN: National Liberation Front

² (DA: Democrats for Andorra
(PS: Social Democratic Party

³ (FV: Victory Front
(PJ: Justicialist Party
(PS: Socialist Party
(FP: Federal Peronist

/ Rassemblement national démocratique)

/ Front de libération nationale)

/ Démocrates pour Andorre)

/ Parti social-démocrate)

/ Front de la victoire)

/ Parti justicialiste)

/ Parti socialiste)

/ Péroniste fédéral)

ESTRADA, Juan Hector (Mr./M.)
Secretary of the Group and to the delegation
Secrétaire du Groupe et de la délégation

Parliamentary Secretary, Senate
Secrétaire parlementaire, Sénat

ZORZOLI, Roberto (Mr./M.)

Head of the International Relations General Directorate's
Office, Senate / Chef du Bureau de la Direction générale
des relations internationales du Sénat

IRRAZABAL, Silvina (Ms./Mme)

Adviser, Senate / Conseillère au Sénat

SEARA, Luis (Mr./M.)

Adviser, Chamber of Deputies
Conseiller à la Chambre des Députés

URRIOLABETTIA, Gonzalo (Mr./M.)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ministère des affaires étrangères

ARMENIA – ARMENIE

CHSHMARITIAN, Karen (Mr./M.)
Member of the Executive Committee, Member of
the Governing Council, Leader of the delegation
Membre du Comité exécutif, Membre du Conseil
directeur, Chef de la délégation

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (HHK)

BISHARYAN, Haghine (Mrs./Mme)
Member of the Governing Council
Membre du Conseil directeur

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (ROLF) ⁴

GHAZARYAN, Zabela (Ms./Mme)
Secretary to the delegation
Secrétaire de la délégation

Senior Specialist of the External Relations Department
Chargée principale des relations extérieures

AUSTRALIA – AUSTRALIE

ADAMS, Dick (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (ALP)

SECKER, Patrick (Mr./M.)

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (LP)

FITZGIBBON, Joel (Mr./M.)

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (ALP)

JENKINS, Harry (Mr./M.)

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (ALP)

BOYCE, Sue (Ms./Mme)

Senator / Sénatrice (LP) ⁵

STEPHENS, Ursula (Ms./Mme)

Senator / Sénatrice

ELDER, David (Mr./M.)
Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP

Deputy Clerk of the House of Representatives
Secrétaire général adjoint de la Chambre des Représentants

RADCLIFFE, Jeanette (Ms./Mme)
Secretary to the delegation
Secrétaire de la délégation

AUSTRIA – AUTRICHE

SILHAVY, Heidrun (Mrs./Mme)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Member of the National Council
Membre du Conseil national (SPÖ)

NEUGEBAUER, Fritz (Mr./M.)

Vice-President of the National Council
Vice-Président du Conseil national (ÖVP)

⁴ (HHK: Republican Party of Armenia
(ROLF: "Rule of Law" Faction

/ Parti républicain arménien)
/ Parti "L'Etat de droit")

⁵ (ALP: Australian Labour Party
(LP: Liberal Party

/ Parti travailliste australien)
/ Parti libéral)

GRAF, Martin (Mr./M.)	Third President of the National Council Troisième Président du Conseil national (FPÖ)
MOSER, Gabriela (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Council Membre du Conseil national (G) ⁶
BRENNER, Brigitte (Ms./Mme)	Head of the EU and International Services Chef des Services européen et international
LANDERTSHAMMER, Sophie (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation / Secrétaire de la délégation	International Relations Division Division des relations internationales

AZERBAIJAN – AZERBAIDJAN

ALIYEV, Ilham (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
MIRASLANOV, Hliman (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
HUSEYNOVA, Sevinj (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
MURADOV, Fuad (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
AGAYEV, Babek (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation / Secrétaire de la délégation	

BAHRAIN – BAHREIN

FAKHRO, Jamal (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	First Deputy Speaker of the Shura Council Premier Vice-Président du Conseil consultatif
AL-MUBARAK, Aysha (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Shura Council Membre du Conseil consultatif
NASSIF, Jameela (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Council of Representatives Membre du Conseil des Représentants
ABDULLA, Ali (Mr./M.)	Member of the Council of Representatives Membre du Conseil des Représentants
TAQAWI, Sawsan (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Council of Representatives Membre du Conseil des Représentants
ALKOOHEJI, Isa (Mr./M.)	Member of the Council of Representatives Membre du Conseil des Représentants
ALJEEB, Fouzia (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Director, Parliamentary Relations and Information Directrice des relations parlementaires et de l'information
ALHADDAD, Abdulla (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	
ALQATTAF, Aameera (Ms./Mme)	Staff Member / Secrétariat

⁶ (SPÖ: Social Democratic Party
(ÖVP: People's Party
(FPÖ: Freedom Party
(G: Greens

/ Parti social démocrate)
/ Parti populaire)
/ Parti de la liberté)
/ Les Verts)

BANGLADESH

HAMID, Md. Abdul (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Speaker of Parliament / Président du Parlement (AL)
AHMED, Tofail (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament, Chairman of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Ministry of Industries / Membre du Parlement, Président de la Commission permanente de l'industrie (AL)
ISLAM, Rafiqul (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament, Chairman of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Ministry of Liberation War Affairs Membre du Parlement, Président de la Commission permanente des questions liées à l'indépendance (AL)
CHOWDHURY, Jafrul Islam (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (BNP)
HAQUE, Md. Mujibul (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (JP)
CHOWDHURY, Saber Hossain (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (AL)
ATIK, Md. Atiur Rahman (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (AL)
CHOWDHURY, A.B.M. Fazle Karim (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ministry of Housing and Public Works Membre du Parlement, Président de la Commission permanente du logement et des travaux publics (AL)
GINI, Mahabub Ara Begum (Ms./Mme)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (AL) ⁷
KHANAM, Sanjilda (Ms./Mme)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
RAHMAN, Md. Mahfuzur (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP, Secretary of the Group Membre de l'ASGP, Secrétaire du Groupe	Secretary / Secrétaire
BARUA, Shampad (Mr./M.)	Additional Secretary / Secrétaire supplémentaire
HYE, Md. Abdul (Mr./M.)	Assistant Private Secretary to the Speaker Secrétaire particulier adjoint du Président
HOQUE, Md. Nazmul (Mr./M.)	Senior Assistant Secretary / Secrétaire principal adjoint
SHIL, Shishir (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	

BELGIUM – BELGIQUE

de DONNEA, François-Xavier (Mr./M.) President of the Committee on Middle East Questions, Member of the Committee to Promote Respect for International Humanitarian Law, Member of the Governing Council, Leader of the delegation / Président du Comité sur les questions relatives au Moyen-Orient, Membre du Comité chargé de promouvoir le respect du droit international humanitaire, Membre du Conseil directeur, Chef de la délégation	Member of the House of Representatives, State Minister, President of the Committee on Foreign Relations Membre de la Chambre des Représentants, Ministre d'Etat, Président de la Commission des relations extérieures (MR)
MAHOUX, Philippe (Mr./M.) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Senator, Co-Chairman of the Committee on European Affairs / Sénateur, Co-Président du Comité d'avis fédéral chargé des questions européennes (PS)
VAN EETVELDE, Miranda (Ms./Mme) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (N-VA)
COËME, Guy (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (PS) ⁸

⁷ (AL: Bangladesh Awami League
(BNP: Bangladesh Nationalist Party
(JP: Jatiya Party

/ Ligue Awami du Bangladesh)
(Parti nationaliste du Bangladesh)
(Parti Jatiya)

HONDEQUIN, Hugo (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the Senate Secrétaire général du Sénat
DE PELSEMAEKER, Ides (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Deputy Secretary General of the House of Representatives Secrétaire général adjoint de la Chambre des Représentants
DE ROUCK, Marc (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group and to the delegation Secrétaire du Groupe et de la délégation	Director, European Affairs and Inter-Parliamentary Relations Department, Senate / Directeur du Service des affaires européennes et des relations interparlementaires du Sénat
PELEMAN, Martin (Mr./M.) Deputy Secretary of the Group and to the delegation Secrétaire adjoint du Groupe et de la délégation	Senior Adviser, House of Representatives Premier Conseiller à la Chambre des Représentants

BENIN

NAGO, Mathurin (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Member of the Governing Council, Leader of the delegation / Président du Groupe, Membre du Conseil directeur, Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale (FCBE)
QUENUM, Epiphane (Mr./M.) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (RB)
SANI GLELE, Yibatou (Ms./Mme) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PRD)
GONROUDOBOU, Orou Dèkè (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (FCBE)
ZINSOU, Edmond (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PRD)
AHINNOU, Thomas (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (FCBE) ⁹
KOTO SOUNON, René (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Deputy Administrative Secretary General Secrétaire général administratif adjoint
GUIDI, Kouassi (Mr./M.)	Protocol Officer / Chargé du protocole
BONOU, Lucien (Mr./M.) Aide de camp	

BOLIVIA – BOLIVIE

RAMIREZ NAVA, Agripina (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
ALTAMIRANO TRUJILLO, Raúl (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
NAVARRO TARDÍO, Jaime (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
LEIGUE HERRERA, Javier (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
LUNA ZEBALLOS, Ibonne Daysi (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
EFRAIN, Condori (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur
GARCIA MENDEZ, Hugo (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur

⁸ (MR: Liberal Party (French) / Parti libéral (francophone))
(PS: Socialist Party (French) / Parti socialiste (francophone))
(N-VA: New Flemish Alliance / Nouvelle Alliance flamande)

⁹ (FCBE: Cauri Forces for an Emerging Benin / Forces Cauris pour un Bénin Emergent)
(RB: Rebirth of Benin / Renaissance du Bénin)
(PRD: Democratic Renewal Party / Parti du renouveau démocratique)

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA – BOSNIE-HERZEGOVINE

KALABIĆ, Drago (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Member of the Parliamentary Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée parlementaire (SNSD)
FRANJIČEVIĆ, Mato (Mr./M.)	Member of the Parliamentary Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée parlementaire (HDZ) ¹⁰
MIJAČEVIĆ, Marina (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation / Secrétaire de la délégation	

BOTSWANA

MOLATLHEGI, Kagiso Patrick (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (BDP)
REATILE, Mephato (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (BDP)
SALESHANDO, Dumelang (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (BCP) ¹¹
DITHAPO, Barbara Ntheeleng (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General / Secrétaire générale
KEEKAE, Lesedi (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Senior Clerk Assistant / Assistant Greffier principal

BRAZIL – BRÉSIL

LINS, Atila (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (PSD)
SANTOS, Alexandre (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Senator / Sénateur (PMDB)
NAPOLEÃO, Hugo (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (PSD)
QUINTELLA LESSA, Mauricio (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (PR)
DA FONTE, Eduardo (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (PP)
MUDALEN, Jorge Tadeu (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (DEM)
AZEREDO, Eduardo (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (PSDB) ¹²
TEIXEIRA, Rogério (Mr./M.)	Director General, Chamber of Deputies Directeur général à la Chambre des Députés
FURTADO, Adolfo (Mr./M.)	Director, Chamber of Deputies Directeur à la Chambre des Députés
CABRAL de ARAÚJO, Silvia (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation / Secrétaire de la délégation	
AZEVEDO, Paulo (Mr./M.) Diplomat / Diplomate	

¹⁰ (SNSD: Party of Independent Social Democrats / Parti social-démocrate indépendant)
(HDZ: Croatian Democratic Union / Parti démocratique croate)

¹¹ (BDP: Botswana Democratic Party / Parti démocratique botswanais)
(BCP: Botswana Congress Party / Parti du Congrès du Botswana)

¹² (PSD: Social Democratic Party / Parti social-démocrate)
(PMDB: Brazilian Democratic Movement Party / Parti du mouvement démocratique brésilien)
(PR: Party of the Republic / Parti de la République)
(PP: Progressive Party / Parti progressiste)
(DEM: Democrats / Démocrates)
(PSDB: Brazilian Social Democratic Party / Parti social-démocrate brésilien)

BULGARIA – BULGARIE

BISSEROV, Hristo (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (DPS) ¹³
KURUMBASHEV, Peter (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
GADJEVA, Denitsa (Ms./Mlle)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
SLAVCHOV, Ivan (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the National Assembly Secrétaire général de l'Assemblée nationale
KOUKLEVA, Sonya (Ms./Mme) Interpreter / Interprète	Protocol Officer / Chargée du protocole

BURKINA FASO

KABORÉ, Roch Marc Christian (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale
DIENDERE, Fatoumata (Ms./Mme)	Second Vice-President of the National Assembly Deuxième Vice-Présidente de l'Assemblée nationale
BADO, Dema Raphaël (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (ADF/RDA)
OUEDRAOGO, Salfó Théodore (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (ADJ)
DICKO, Amadou Diemdioda (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (CFR)
KABORÉ-KOALA, Aline (Mrs./Mme) Member of the Executive Committee Membre du Comité exécutif	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (CDP)
DRABO-OUEDRAOGO, Zénabou (Ms./Mme) Member of the Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians / Membre du Comité de coordination des femmes parlementaires	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
TRAORE, Mélégué (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (CDP) ¹⁴
NOMBRE, Alphonse (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the National Assembly Secrétaire général de l'Assemblée nationale
KERE, Dieudonné (Mr./M.) Administrative Secretary of the Group Secrétaire administratif du Groupe	Director of International Cooperation, National Assembly Directeur de la coopération internationale de l'Assemblée nationale
OUEDRAOGO, François (Mr./M.) Aide de camp	

BURUNDI

KABURA, François (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Second Vice-President of the National Assembly Deuxième Vice-Président de l'Assemblée nationale (UPRONA) ¹⁵
BARINAKANDI, Juvénal (Mr./M.)	Protocol Officer / Chargé du protocole

¹³ (DPS: Movement for Rights and Freedoms

¹⁴ (ADF/RDA: Alliance for democracy and Federation /
African Democratic Rally

(ADJ: Alliance for democracy and justice

(CFR: Convention of Republican Forces

(CDP: Congress for Democracy and Progress

¹⁵ (UPRONA: Union for National Progress

/ Mouvement pour les droits et les libertés)

/ Alliance pour la démocratie et la fédération /
Rassemblement démocratique africain)

/ Alliance pour la démocratie et la justice)

/ Convention des forces républicaines)

/ Congrès pour la démocratie et le progrès)

/ Union pour le progrès national)

CAMBODIA – CAMBODGE

HENG SAMRIN, Samdech (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale
CHHEANG, Vun (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, International Cooperation, Information and Media / Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Président de la Commission des affaires étrangères, de la coopération internationale, de l'information et des médias
YANG, Sem (Mr./M.)	Senator, Chairperson of the First Commission of the Senate Sénateur, Président de la première Commission du Sénat
NHEM, Thavy (Mr./M.) Member of the Executive Committee Membre du Comité exécutif	Member of the National Assembly, Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights and Complaints / Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Président de la Commission des droits de l'homme et des plaintes
TROEUNG, Thavy (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
OUM, Sarith (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the Senate Secrétaire général du Sénat
LENG, Peng Long (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the National Assembly Secrétaire général de l'Assemblée nationale
BAN, Srey Mom (Mrs./Mme) Secretary to the delegation / Secrétaire de la délégation	Advisor to the Speaker of the National Assembly Conseillère du Président de l'Assemblée nationale
KIM, Santepheap (Mr./M.)	Advisor to the Speaker of the National Assembly Conseiller du Président de l'Assemblée nationale
KOAM, Kosal (Mr./M.)	Chief of Cabinet of the Speaker Chef de Cabinet du Président
KEO, Piseth (Mr./M.)	Vice-Chief of Cabinet of the Speaker Chef de Cabinet adjoint du Président
PHY, Tara (Mr./M.)	Deputy Director General of the Administration and Finance Department / Directeur général adjoint du Département de l'administration et des finances
HENG, Peou (Ms./Mme)	Advisor to the Speaker / Conseillère du Président
PROM, Virak (Mr./M.)	Director of the Protocol Department Directeur du Département du protocole
CHHIM, Sothkun (Mr./M.)	Director of the Protocol and International Relations Department of the Senate / Directeur du Département du protocole et des relations internationales du Sénat
OU DAM, Khlang (Mr./M.) Assistant to the delegation Assistant de la délégation	Deputy Director of the International Relations Department, National Assembly / Directeur adjoint du Département des relations internationales de l'Assemblée nationale
VANNA, Tim (Mr./M.)	Deputy Director of the Protocol Department Directeur adjoint du Département du protocole
SOK, Pisey (Mr./M.) Assistant to the delegation / Assistant de la délégation	Deputy Chief of the Multilateral Relations Office Chef adjoint du Bureau des relations multilatérales
NHIM, Dalin (Ms./Mme)	Officer, Multilateral Relations Office Bureau des relations multilatérales
KOSAL, Khemrith (Mr./M.)	Assistant to the Speaker / Assistant du Président
SOUN, Sina (Dr.) Personal Doctor to the Speaker Médecin particulier du Président	
TOP, Sareoun (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	
SREY, Sorin (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	
KAM, Sokhan (Mr./M.) Security Officer to the Speaker Agent de sécurité du Président	

CAMEROON – CAMEROUN

CAVAYE YEGUIE, Djibril (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale (RDPC)
FOTSO, Joséphine (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (RDPC)
ABDOULAYE, Bougue (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (RDPC)
EKINDI, Jean-Jacques (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PM)
EMAH ETOUNDI, Vincent (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (RDPC)
HAMADOU, Sali (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (RDPC) ¹⁶
YÉNÉ OSSOMBA, Victor (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the National Assembly Secrétaire général de l'Assemblée nationale
ESSEBA, Cyriaque (Mr./M.) Administrative Secretary of the Group Secrétaire administratif du Groupe	Director, General Administration Service Directeur de l'administration générale
BOUBA, Simala (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Officer, Speaker's Bureau Fonctionnaire au Cabinet du Président
MAKONGO DOOH, Alexandre (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	

CANADA

DAWSON, Dennis (Mr./M.) Second Vice-President of the Group, Leader of the delegation / Deuxième Vice-Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Senator / Sénateur (LIB)
ATAULLAHJAN, Salma (Ms./Mme)	Senator / Sénatrice (CPC)
FORTIN-DUPLESSIS, Suzanne (Ms./Mme)	Senator / Sénatrice (CPC)
FRASER, Joan (Ms./Mme)	Senator / Sénatrice (LIB)
ARMSTRONG, Scott (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Commons Membre de la Chambre des Communes (CPC)
BENNETT, Carolyn (Ms./Mme)	Member of the House of Commons Membre de la Chambre des Communes (LIB)
CALKINS, Blaine (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Commons Membre de la Chambre des Communes (CPC)
CHARLTON, Chris (Ms./Mme) First Vice-President of the Group Première Vice-Présidente du Groupe	Member of the House of Commons Membre de la Chambre des Communes (NDP)
CROWDER, Jean (Ms./Mme)	Member of the House of Commons Membre de la Chambre des Communes (NDP)
RAVIGNAT, Mathieu (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Commons Membre de la Chambre des Communes (NDP)
COOLS, Anne C. (Ms./Mme)	Senator / Sénatrice (IND)
HIEBERT, Russ (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Commons Membre de la Chambre des Communes (CPC)
GALLANT, Cheryl (Ms./Mme) Adviser (21-23/10) / Conseillère (21-23/10)	Member of the House of Commons Membre de la Chambre des Communes (CPC)

¹⁶ (RDPC: Cameroon People's Democratic Movement
PM: Progressive Movement

/ Rassemblement démocratique du peuple camerounais)
/ Mouvement progressiste)

HOBACK, Randy (Mr./M.) Adviser (19-21/10) / Conseiller (19-21/10)	Member of the House of Commons Membre de la Chambre des Communes (CPC)
TARDIF, Claudette (Ms./Mme) Adviser (21-22/10) / Conseillère (21-22/10)	Senator / Sénatrice (LIB)
DAY, Joseph (Mr./M.) Adviser (21-22/10) / Conseiller (21-22/10)	Senator / Sénateur (LIB)
SELLAH, Dajaouida (Ms./Mme) Adviser (25-26/10) / Conseillère (25-26/10)	Member of the House of Commons Membre de la Chambre des Communes (NDP)
TRUDEAU, Justin (Mr./M.) Adviser (24-25/10) / Conseiller (24-25/10)	Member of the House of Commons Membre de la Chambre des Communes (LIB) ¹⁷
O'BRIEN, Gary W. (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Clerk, Senate and Clerk of Parliaments Secrétaire général du Sénat et Greffier des Parlements
O'BRIEN, Audrey (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Clerk, House of Commons Secrétaire générale de la Chambre des Communes
BOSC, Marc (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Deputy Clerk, House of Commons Sous-Greffier, Chambre des Communes
ISLES, Beverley (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Clerk Assistant, House of Commons Greffière assistante à la Chambre des Communes
GRAVEL, Line (Mrs./Mme) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Association Secretary / Secrétaire d'association
FORGE, Frédéric (Mr./M.) Advisor to the Group / Conseiller du Groupe	Analyst, Library of Parliament Analyste, Bibliothèque du Parlement
BRADLEY, Heather (Ms./Mme)	Director of Communication Directrice de la communication
CARRUTHERS, Alexander (Mr./M.)	Assistant to Mr. Hoback / Assistant de M. Hoback

CAPE VERDE – CAP-VERT

LOPES CORREIA, Júlio (Mr./M.)	Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly Vice-Président de l'Assemblée nationale
GOMES, Joaquim Augusto (Mr./M.)	Advisor to the Speaker/ Conseiller du Président
MENDES, Joaquim Augusto (Mr./M.)	Assistant
MENDES, Maria (Ms./Mme)	Staff / Secrétariat
FONTES, Pedro (Mr./M.)	Staff / Secrétariat

CHAD – TCHAD

KABADI, Haroun (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale
KADAM, Moussa (Mr./M.) President of the Group / Président du Groupe	Member of the National Assembly, Parliamentary Group Chairman / Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Président du Groupe parlementaire (MPS)
GALI, Ngothé Gata (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly, Chairman of the Committee on Economy and Development / Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Président de la Commission de l'économie et du développement (UFD/PR)
HAMID, Kodya Moustapha (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (MPS)

¹⁷ (LIB: Liberal Party
(CPC: Conservative Party of Canada
(NDP: New Democratic Party
(IND: Indépendant

/ Parti libéral)
/ Parti conservateur du Canada)
/ Nouveau parti démocratique)
/ Indépendant)

MAHAMAT, Ousmane Ngargnague (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (UDT)
NEATOBEI, Bidi Valentin (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PAP/JS)
TCHARI, Madi Maïna (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (RDP)
ISSAKHA HAROUN, Fatouma (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (MPS)
BIOUH, Pabamé Dallah (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (RNDT/Le Réveil)
NDOUABNADJI, Taram Delphine (Ms./Mme) Adviser / Conseillère	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (FAR-PF) ¹⁸
MBAÏAMMADJI, Béain Joël (Mr./M.)	Director, Administrative and Legislative Affairs Directeur des affaires administratives et législatives

CHILE – CHILI

LETELIER, Juan Pablo (Mr./M.) Vice-President of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians, Leader of the delegation Vice-Président du Comité des droits de l'homme des parlementaires, Chef de la délégation	Senator / Sénateur (PS)
WALKER, Patricio (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur (PDC)
BALTOLU, Nino (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (UDI)
CRISTI, María Angélica (Mrs./Mme) Member of the Committee on Middle East Questions Membre du Comité sur les questions relatives au Moyen-Orient	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (UDI)
ISASI, Marta (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (Ind)
JARPA, Carlos (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (PRSD)
LEÓN, Roberto (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (PDC) ¹⁹
LABBÉ, Mario (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the Senate Secrétaire général du Sénat
OSÉS, Juan (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate Commission des affaires étrangères du Sénat
PEILLARD GARCÍA, Jacqueline (Mrs./Mme) Secretary of the Group and to the delegation Secrétaire du Groupe et de la délégation	Director, International Relations, Chamber of Deputies Directrice des relations internationales à la Chambre des Députés
FONTECILLA, Mariano (Mr./M.)	Diplomatic Adviser / Conseiller diplomatique

¹⁸ (MPS: Patriotic Salvation Movement
(UDT: Democratic Union of Chad
(RDP: Rally for Democracy and Progress
(RNDT/Le Réveil: Rally of Chadian Nationalists
(FAR: Front of Action Forces for the Republic

¹⁹ (PS: Socialist Party
(PDC: Christian Democratic Party
(UDI: Independent Democratic Union
(Ind: Independent
(PRSD: Radical Party

/ Mouvement patriotique du salut
/ Union démocratique tchadienne
/ Rassemblement pour la démocratie et le progrès)
/ Rassemblement des Nationalistes Tchadiens)
/ Front des forces d'action pour la République)
/ Parti socialiste)
/ Parti démocrate-chrétien)
/ Union démocrate indépendante)
/ Indépendant)
/ Parti radical)

CHINA – CHINE

ZHA PEIXIN (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Member of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, Vice-Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs Membre de la Commission permanente de l'Assemblée populaire nationale, Vice-Président du Comité des affaires étrangères
HE KENG (Mr./M.)	Member of the National People's Congress, Vice-Chairman of the Financial and Economic Affairs Committee / Membre de l'Assemblée populaire nationale, Vice-Président de la Commission des affaires financières et économiques
WU QIDI (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National People's Congress Membre de l'Assemblée populaire nationale
DAI YUZHONG (Mr./M.)	Member of the National People's Congress Membre de l'Assemblée populaire nationale
LI XIAOBIN (Mr./M.)	Deputy Director General, Foreign Affairs Bureau, General Office, National People's Congress Standing Committee Directeur général adjoint, Bureau des affaires étrangères, Comité permanent de l'Assemblée populaire nationale
HU WEN (Ms./Mme)	Director, Foreign Affairs Bureau Directrice du Bureau des affaires étrangères
QIAN YANQING (Ms./Mme) Interpreter / Interprète	
XIONG WEI (Mr./M.)	Director, Foreign Affairs Bureau, General Office, National People's Congress Standing Committee / Directeur du Bureau des affaires étrangères, Comité permanent de l'Assemblée populaire nationale
CHI TIAN (Ms./Mme)	Secretary / Secrétaire
JIANG BO (Mr./M.)	Secretary / Secrétaire
LIN JINHUA (Ms./Mme) Interpreter / Interprète	
GAO MING (Mr./M.) Interpreter / Interprète	

COLOMBIA – COLOMBIE

BARRERAS, Roy (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	President of the Senate / Président du Sénat
CORZO ROMÁN, Juan Manuel (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur (CP)
MOTA Y MORAD, Karime (Ms./Mme)	Senator, Chairperson of the Senate First Committee Sénatrice, Présidente de la Première Commission du Sénat (Partido de la U)
GALÁN PACHÓN, Juan Manuel (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur (PL)
ANDRADE SERRANO, Hernán (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur (CP) ²⁰
GARCÍA, Teresita (Ms./Mme)	Senator / Sénatrice
GOMEZ, Lorraine (Ms./Mme)	Protocol Officer / Chargée du protocole

²⁰ (CP: Conservative Party
(Partido de la U: Social Party of National Unity
(PL: Liberal Party

/ Parti conservateur)
/ Parti social de l'unité nationale)
/ Parti libéral)

COSTA RICA

MONESTEL CONTRERAS, Martín (Mr./M.) Member of the Legislative Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée législative (PASE) ²¹

COTE D'IVOIRE

SORO, Guillaume Kigbafori (Mr./M.) Speaker of the National Assembly
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation Président de l'Assemblée nationale

DAN OUELO, Michel (Mr./M.) Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly
Vice-Président de l'Assemblée nationale

ARNAULT, Bamba Sogona (Ms./Mme) Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale

BAMBA, Affoussy (Ms./Mme) Member of the National Assembly, Chairperson of
the Committee on General and Institutional Affairs
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Présidente de la
Commission des affaires générales et institutionnelles

KOBY, Aka Basile (Mr./M.) Acting Secretary General of the National Assembly
Secrétaire général de l'Assemblée nationale par intérim

TOURE, Moussa (Mr./M.) Special Advisor, Communication
Conseiller spécial en communication

KONE, Souleymane (Mr./M.) Special Advisor, Protocol / Conseiller spécial du protocole

FOFANA, Abdoulaye (Mr./M.)
Aide de camp

CROATIA – CROATIE

DUROVIĆ, Dražen (Mr./M.) Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (HDSSB) ²²
President of the Group, Leader of the delegation
Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation

KREŠIĆ, Ilijana (Mrs./Mme)
Secretary of the Group and to the delegation
Secrétaire du Groupe et de la délégation

CUBA

PEZ FERRO, Ramón (Mr./M.) Member of the National Assembly of the People's Power,
President of the Foreign Affairs Committee / Membre de
Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation l'Assemblée nationale du Pouvoir populaire, Président de
la Commission des affaires étrangères

REGUEIFEROS LINARES, Yenielys (Ms./Mme) Member of the National Assembly of the People's Power
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale du Pouvoir populaire

MARTINEZ, Ada (Mrs./Mme)
Administrative Secretary of the Group
Secrétaire administrative du Groupe

GONZÁLEZ, Alain (Mr./M.)
Consul General / Consul général

²¹ (PASE: Accessibility Without Exclusion / Parti de l'accès sans exclusion)

²² (HDSSB: Croatian Democratic Alliance of Slavonia and Baranja / Alliance démocratique de Slavonie et Baranja)

CYPRUS – CHYPRE

VARNAVA, George (Mr./M.) Member of the Governing Council, Leader of the delegation / Membre du Conseil directeur, Chef de la délégation	Member of the House of Representatives, Chairman of the Committee on Defence / Membre de la Chambre des Représentants, Président de la Commission de la défense (EDEK)
MICHAELIDIS, Andreas (Mr./M.) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants
KOUKOUMA KOUTRA, Skevi (Mrs./Mme) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Member of the House of Representatives, Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Refugees, Enclaved, Missing, Adversely Affected Persons / Membre de la Chambre des Représentants, Présidente de la Commission des réfugiés, des personnes enclavées, des personnes disparues et des personnes en situation difficile (AKEL)
KYRIAKIDOU, Athina (Ms./Mme)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (DIKO) ²³
CHRISTOU, Avgousta (Mrs./Mme) Secretary to the delegation / Secrétaire de la délégation	International Relations Officer A Chargée des relations extérieures A

CZECH REPUBLIC – REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE

FUKSA, Ivan (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (ODS)
PARKANOVÁ, Vlasta (Ms./Mme)	Deputy Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies, Deputy Chairperson of the Steering Committee / Vice-Présidente de la Chambre des Députés, Vice-Présidente du Bureau restreint (TOP09-S)
LOBKOWICZ, Jaroslav (Mr./M.) Member of the Group of Facilitators for Cyprus Membre du Groupe de facilitateurs concernant Chypre	Member of the Chamber of Deputies, Deputy Chairman of the Committee on European Affairs / Membre de la Chambre des Députés, Vice-Président de la Commission des affaires européennes (TOP09-S)
SOBOTKA, Bohuslav (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (ČSSD)
HORSKÁ, Miluše (Ms./Mme)	Senator / Sénatrice
GUZIANA, Petr (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur (ČSSD) ²⁴
NOVOTNY, Josef (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
KYNŠTETR, Petr (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the Chamber of Deputies Secrétaire général de la Chambre des Députés
UKLEIN, Jiri (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the Senate Secrétaire général du Sénat
KRBEC, Jiri (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Head of the International Relations Department of the Senate Chef du Département des relations internationales du Sénat
KRUPOVA, Veronika (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation / Secrétaire de la délégation	

²³ (EDEK: Movement of Social Democrats
(AKEL: Progressive Party of the Working People
(DIKO: Democratic Party
²⁴ (ODS: Civic Democratic Party
(TOP09-S: Tradition Responsibility Prosperity 09
(ČSSD: Czech Social Democratic Party

/ Mouvement social-démocrate)
/ Parti progressiste des masses laborieuses)
/ Parti démocratique)
/ Parti démocratique civique)
/ Tradition, responsabilité, prospérité 09)
/ Parti social-démocrate tchèque)

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO – REPUBLIQUE DEMOCRATIQUE DU CONGO

MINAKU, Aubin (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale (PPRD)
MOKOLO, Edouard (Mr./M.)	First Vice-President of the Senate Premier Vice-Président du Sénat
MBUKU, Laka Boris (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
EKOMBE, Mpetshi Toussaint (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PDC)
MOMA BOKONDA, Régine (Ms./Mme)	Senator / Sénatrice
MOKENI ATANINGAMU, Jean-Claude (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur
RAMAZANI, Shadari Emmanuel (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PPRD)
TSHIMANGA, Buana Jean-Pierre (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (ADR)
BOKOLOMBE, Batuli Sam (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (UNC)
KABAMBA FATAKI, Amiral (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Senator / Sénateur (PPRD) ²⁵
DYOWO OMALOKOHO YAAO, Daniel (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Director / Directeur
MUDIPANU NDAIE, Alex (Mr./M.)	Secretary to the Speaker / Secrétaire du Président
KABANGU DIBA-NSESE, François (Mr./M.) Administrative Joint Secretary of the Group Co-Secrétaire administratif du Groupe	Adviser and Coordinator, Senate Research Office Conseiller coordonnateur du Bureau d'études du Sénat
MOSWALA, Marcel (Mr./M.)	Adviser to the Vice-President of the Senate Conseiller du Président du Sénat
MAVUNGU, Jean-Pierre (Mr./M.)	Office Director / Directeur de cabinet
MUTUMBE, Mbuya Crispin (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Parliamentary Adviser / Conseiller parlementaire
KANYINDA, Jordan (Mr./M.)	Protocol Officer / Chargé du protocole
DROZA WINYI, Joseph (Mr./M.) Diplomat / Diplomate	

DENMARK – DANEMARK

LORENTZEN, Kristian Pihl (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Member of the Folketing / Membre du Folketing (LP)
CHRISTIANSEN, Kim (Mr./M.)	Member of the Folketing / Membre du Folketing (DPP)
BJERREGAARD, Jacob (Mr./M.)	Member of the Folketing / Membre du Folketing (SD)
STOEJBERG, Inger (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Folketing / Membre du Folketing (LP)
HAV, Orla (Mr./M.)	Member of the Folketing / Membre du Folketing (SD)
AMMITZBOELL, Simon Emil (Mr./M.)	Member of the Folketing / Membre du Folketing (LA)
SCHMIDT, Hans Chr. (Mr./M.)	Member of the Folketing / Membre du Folketing (LP)
SKOVSBY, Julie (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Folketing / Membre du Folketing (SD) ²⁶

²⁵ (PPRD: People's Party for Reconstruction and Democracy
(PDC: Democratic Christian Party
(UNC: Union for the Congolese Nation

/ Parti du peuple pour la reconstruction et la démocratie)
/ Parti démocrate chrétien)
/ Union pour la nation congolaise)
²⁶ (LP: Liberal Party
/ Parti libéral)

LARSEN, Carsten U. (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General / Secrétaire général
VESTERGAARD, Mette (Ms./Mme) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Counselor / Conseiller
LARSON, Claudius (Mr./M.) Assistant Secretary / Secrétaire assistant	Higher Executive Officer / Cadre supérieur

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC – REPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE

ARIAS, Orfelina Liseloth (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
FERMIN, Graciela (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
GARCÍA, Carlos Gabriel (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
GARCÍA, Carlos María (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
GUILLÉN, José Nelson (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
SANDÓVAL, Leoncio (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés
SOTO, Rosa Inés (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation / Secrétaire de la délégation	Assistant, International Relations Assistante, Relations internationales

ECUADOR – EQUATEUR

CORDERO, Fernando (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale (AP)
CASSINELLI, Juan Carlos (Mr./M.)	Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly Vice-Président de l'Assemblée nationale
BUSTAMANTE, Fernando (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (AP)
FERNANDEZ, Scheznarda (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (AP) ²⁷
CUJI COELLO, Henry Alberto (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
SEGOVIA, Andrés (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General / Secrétaire général
ALMEIDA ECHEVERRIA, Elena del Carmen (Ms./Mme)	Director, International Relations Directrice des relations internationales
ORTEGA, Julia (Ms./Mme)	Director, Social Communication Directrice de la communication sociale
LEDESMA, Galo (Mr./M.)	Protocol Director / Directeur du protocole
HERRERA, Silvia (Ms./Mme)	Assistant, International Relations Assistante, Relations internationales
ANDRADE, Alejandra (Ms./Mme)	Assistant, International Relations Assistante, Relations internationales
GUEVARA, Edison (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	

(DPP: Danish Peoples' Party
(SD: Social Democratic Party
(LA: Liberal Alliance
²⁷ (AP: Alianza Pais)

/ Parti populaire danois)
(Parti social-démocrate)
(Alliance libérale)

GUAMAN, Jorge (Mr./M.)

Press / Presse

ADDATY, Fernando (Mr./M.)

Aide de camp

TERAN-PARRAL, Andres (Mr./M.)

Ambassador of Ecuador to Canada

Ambassadeur de l'Équateur au Canada

ANDRADE, César (Mr./M.)

Protocol Officer / Chargé du protocole

EGYPT – EGYPTÉ

FAHMY, Ahmad (Mr./M.)

Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Speaker of the Shoura Assembly

Président de l'Assemblée de la Choura

EL BAB, Ali Fath (Mr./M.)

Member of the Shoura Assembly, Majority Leader

Membre de l'Assemblée de la Choura, Chef de la majorité

ABD EL SALAM, Ali Abd El Tawab (Mr./M.)

Member of the Shoura Assembly

Membre de l'Assemblée de la Choura

KAMAL SALIB, Maryan Malak (Ms./Mme)

Member of the Shoura Assembly

Membre de l'Assemblée de la Choura

EL SALVADOR

REYES, Othon Sigfrido (Mr./M.)

Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

President of the Legislative Assembly

Président de l'Assemblée législative (FMLN)²⁸

GUEVARA, Norma (Ms./Mme)

Member of the Legislative Assembly

Membre de l'Assemblée législative

MACHUCA, José Rafael (Mr./M.)

Member of the Legislative Assembly

Membre de l'Assemblée législative

ROSALES Ivan (Mr./M.)

Member of the ASGP, Secretary to the delegation

Membre de l'ASGP, Secrétaire de la délégation

Head of the Department of International Relations and

Parliamentary Diplomacy / Chef du Département des relations internationales et de la diplomatie parlementaire

DUARTE GRANADOS, Oscar M. (Mr./M.)

Ambassador of El Salvador to Canada

Ambassadeur de El Salvador au Canada

SOLORZANO, Vladimir (Mr./M.)

Embassy of El Salvador to Canada

Ambassade de El Salvador au Canada

ESTONIA – ESTONIE

KÕIV, Tõnis (Mr./M.)

President of the Group, Leader of the delegation

Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation

Member of the Riigikogu / Membre du Riigikogu (ERP)

NOOL, Erki (Mr./M.)

Member of the Riigikogu / Membre du Riigikogu (IRL)

ÕUNAPUU, Jaan (Mr./M.)

Member of the Riigikogu / Membre du Riigikogu (SDE)

TUUS-LAUL, Marika (Mrs./Mme)

Member of the Riigikogu / Membre du Riigikogu (ECeP)²⁹

ALAJÕE, Maria (Ms./Mme)

Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP

Secretary General of the Riigikogu

Secrétaire générale du Riigikogu

OTSEPP, Riina (Mrs./Mme)

Secretary of the Group and to the delegation

Secrétaire du Groupe et de la délégation

Deputy Head of the Foreign Relations Department

Chef adjoint du Département des relations extérieures

²⁸ (FMLN: Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front

/ Front de libération nationale Farabundo Marti)

²⁹ (ERP: Reform Party

/ Parti de la réforme)

(IRL: Pro Patria and Res Publica Union

/ Union Pro Patria et Res Publica)

(SDE: Estonian Social Democratic Party

/ Parti social-démocrate d'Estonie)

(ECeP: Estonian Centre Party

/ Parti estonien du centre)

ETHIOPIA – ETHIOPIE

GEBREHIWOT, Tekeleberhan Kassa (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the House of the Federation Président de la Chambre de la Fédération (EPRDF)
TILAHUN, Meles (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (EPRDF)
BUAYALEW, Yohannes (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of the Federation, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Constitutional and Regional Affairs / Membre de la Chambre de la Fédération, Président de la Commission permanente des affaires constitutionnelles et régionales (EPRDF)
ESHETE, Ayelech (Mrs./Mme)	Member of Parliament, Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Women, Children and Youth Affairs Membre du Parlement, Présidente de la Commission permanente des questions relatives aux femmes, aux enfants et à la jeunesse (EPRDF)
TESEMA, Tekle (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament, Deputy Chairman of the Standing Committee on Foreign Security and Defence Affairs Membre du Parlement, Vice-Président de la Commission permanente de la sécurité étrangère et de la défense
LEMA, Megersa (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of the Federation Membre de la Chambre de la Fédération
ABDI, Hassen (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Peoples' Representatives, Whip Membre de la Chambre des Représentants du Peuple, Chef de file (ESDP)
ANKO, Daniel (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (EPRDF)
GIZAW, Biruk (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (EPRDF) ³⁰
GEGEBO, Lema Gezume (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
LEMMA, Negus (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the House of Peoples' Representatives Secrétaire général de la Chambre des Représentants du Peuple
NINI ABINO, Habtamu (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the House of the Federation Secrétaire général de la Chambre de la Fédération
YENENEH, Gelaw (Ms./Mme) Adviser / Conseillère	Protocol Officer / Chargée du protocole

FINLAND – FINLANDE

LOHELA, Maria (Ms./Mme) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Présidente du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Member of the Eduskunta / Membre de l'Eduskunta (PS)
KOMI, Katri (Ms./Mme) Vice-President of the Group Vice-Présidente du Groupe	Member of the Eduskunta / Membre de l'Eduskunta (KESK)
HEMMILÄ, Pertti (Mr./M.)	Member of the Eduskunta / Membre de l'Eduskunta (KOK)
KARHU, Saara (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Eduskunta / Membre de l'Eduskunta (SDP)
HALLA-AHO, Jussi (Mr./M.)	Member of the Eduskunta / Membre de l'Eduskunta (PS) ³¹
TIITINEN, Seppo (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General / Secrétaire général

³⁰ (EPRDF: Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front / Front populaire démocratique révolutionnaire de l'Ethiopie)

³¹ (PS: True Finns / Finlandais authentiques)
(KESK: Centre Party / Parti du centre)
(KOK: National Coalition Party / Coalition nationale)
(SDP: Social Democratic Party / Parti social-démocrate)

VUOSIO, Teemu (Mr./M.)
Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe
HUTTUNEN, Marja (Mrs./Mme)
Assistant Secretary of the Group
Secrétaire adjointe du Groupe

Secretary, International Affairs
Secrétaire aux affaires étrangères
Assistant to the International Affairs
Assistante aux affaires internationales

FRANCE

ANDRÉ, Michèle (Mrs./Mme)
President of the Group, Leader of the delegation
Présidente du Groupe, Chef de la délégation

Senator / Sénatrice (PS)

DEL PICCHIA, Robert-Denis (Mr./M.)
President of the Twelve Plus Group
Président du Groupe des Douze Plus

Senator / Sénateur (UMP)

JANQUIN, Serge (Mr./M.)
Member of the Committee on Middle East
Questions / Membre du Comité sur les
questions relatives au Moyen-Orient

Member of the National Assembly / Député (PS)

MARTIN-LALANDE, Patrice (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly / Député (UMP)

DESTANS, Jean-Louis (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly / Député (PS)

GILLOT, Dominique (Ms./Mme)

Senator / Sénatrice (PS)³²

LUQUIENS, Corinne (Ms./Mme)
Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP

Secretary General of the National Assembly
Secrétaire générale de l'Assemblée nationale

DELCAMP, Alain (Mr./M.)
Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP

Secretary General of the Senate
Secrétaire général du Sénat

RIVAILLE, Danièle (Ms./Mme)
Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP

Secretary General of the Questure (Finance) of the
National Assembly / Secrétaire générale de la Questure
de l'Assemblée nationale

BOURASSÉ, Philippe (Mr./M.)
Executive Co-Secretary of the Group
Co-Secrétaire exécutif du Groupe

Deputy Director, Senate / Directeur adjoint au Sénat

DRAIN, Michel (Mr./M.)
Executive Co-Secretary of the Group
Co-Secrétaire exécutif du Groupe

Deputy Director, National Assembly
Directeur adjoint à l'Assemblée nationale

CHALET, Bernard (Mr./M.)
Logistics Officer / Responsable de la logistique

Administrative Secretary at the National Assembly
Secrétaire administratif à l'Assemblée nationale

MICHEL, Alexandre (Mr./M.)
Twelve Plus Group Secretariat
Secrétariat du Groupe des Douze Plus

Administrator, National Assembly
Administrateur à l'Assemblée nationale

CORNET, Anne-Céline (Ms./Mme)
Twelve Plus Group Secretariat
Secrétariat du Groupe des Douze Plus

Deputy Administrator, Senate
Administratrice adjointe au Sénat

LE NAHENEK, Agathe (Miss/Mlle)
Joint Secretary of the ASGP
Co-Secrétaire de l'ASGP

Administrator, National Assembly
Administratrice à l'Assemblée nationale

VÉLASCO, Karine (Ms./Mme)
Administrative Secretary of the ASGP
Secrétaire administrative de l'ASGP

Services Secretary, National Assembly
Secrétaire des Services à l'Assemblée nationale

³² (PS: Socialist Party
(UMP: People's Movement Union

/ Parti socialiste)
/ Union pour un mouvement populaire)

GABON

NZOUBA-NDAMA, Guy (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale (PDG)
TOUNGUI, Paul (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PDG)
NONGOU MOUNDOUNGA, Pauline (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PDG)
MASSALA TSAMBA, Narcisse (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (UPNR)
NTOUTOUME MEBIAME, Aurélien (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PDG)
OWONO NGUEMA, François (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur (PDG)
MOULENGUI-MOUELE, Sophie (Mrs./Mme) Member of the Executive Committee, ex Officio Member of the Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians / Membre du Comité exécutif, Membre de droit du Comité de coordination des Femmes parlementaires	Senator / Sénatrice (PDG) ³³
OWASSANGO, Deaken (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the Senate Secrétaire général du Sénat
PAILLAT, Constant Brice (Mr./M.)	Secretary General of the National Assembly Secrétaire général de l'Assemblée nationale
SOUMOUNA, Edmond (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP, Secretary of the Group Membre de l'ASGP, Secrétaire du Groupe	Deputy Secretary General of the National Assembly Secrétaire général adjoint de l'Assemblée nationale
ROSSATANGA, Lygie (Ms./Mme)	Secretariat / Secrétariat
BOULE, Dieudonné (Mr./M.) Aide de camp to the Speaker Aide de camp du Président	

GERMANY – ALLEMAGNE

LAMMERT, Norbert (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Member of the Governing Council (22/10), Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Membre du Conseil directeur (22/10), Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the Bundestag Président du Bundestag (CDU/CSU)
SILBERHORN, Thomas (Mr./M.) Member of the Governing Council (24/10) Membre du Conseil directeur (24/10)	Member of the Bundestag Membre du Bundestag (CDU/CSU)
KRÜGER-LEISSNER, Angelika (Ms./Mme) Substitute Member of the Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians, Member of the Governing Council (22/10) / Membre suppléant du Comité de coordination des femmes parlementaires, Membre du Conseil directeur (22/10)	Member of the Bundestag Membre du Bundestag (SPD)
ULRICH, Alexander (Mr./M.)	Member of the Bundestag Membre du Bundestag (Die Linke)

³³ (PDG: Gabonese Democratic Party
(UPNR: Union for the new Republic

/ Parti démocratique gabonais)
/ Union pour la nouvelle République)

WINKLER, Josef Philip (Mr./M.) Member of the Executive Committee, Substitute Member of the Committee on Middle East Questions, Member of the Governing Council (22 and 24/10) Membre suppléant de la Commission sur les questions relatives au Moyen-Orient, Membre du Conseil directeur (22 et 24/10)	Member of the Bundestag Membre du Bundestag (Bündnis 90/Grüne) ³⁴
SCHÖLER, Ulrich (Mr./M.) Vice-President of the ASGP / Vice-Président de l'ASGP	Deputy Secretary General of the Bundestag Directeur adjoint du Bundestag
KREBS, Andrea (Ms./Mme) Adviser / Conseillère	Head, International Parliamentary Assemblies Division, Bundestag / Chef de la Division des Assemblées parlementaires internationales du Bundestag
MÜGGENBURG, Hardo (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	International Parliamentary Assemblies Division, Bundestag / Division des Assemblées parlementaires internationales du Bundestag
SARENIO, Susanne (Mrs./Mme) Assistant to the delegation Assistante de la délégation	International Parliamentary Assemblies Division, Bundestag Division des Assemblées parlementaires internationales du Bundestag
BEATRICE, Gelsomina (Mrs./Mme) Assistant to the delegation Assistante de la délégation	International Parliamentary Assemblies Division, Bundestag Division des Assemblées parlementaires internationales du Bundestag

GHANA

BAMFORD-ADDO, Joyce Adeline (Ms./Mme) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of Parliament / Présidente du Parlement
AVOKA, Cletus Apul (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament, Majority Leader Membre du Parlement, Chef de la majorité (NDC)
KYEI-MENSAH-BONSU, Osei (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament, Minority Leader Membre du Parlement, Chef de la minorité (NPP) ³⁵
BUKARI NIPKE, Joseph (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
FRIMPONG, Kofi (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
ANYIMADU, Emmanuel (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP, Secretary of the Group Membre de l'ASGP, Secrétaire du Groupe	Clerk of Parliament / Secrétaire général
BREFO-BOATENG, Evelyn (Ms./Mme) Schedule Officer / Chargée de la programmation	Principal Assistant Clerk / Adjointe du Greffier principal
AKRONG, Edith (Ms./Mme)	Speaker's Private Secretary Secrétaire particulière de la Présidente

GREECE – GRECE

DERMENTZOPOULOS, Alexandros (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Member of the Hellenic Parliament Membre du Parlement hellénique (ND)
KONSTANTOPOULOS, Georgios (Mr./M.)	Member of the Hellenic Parliament Membre du Parlement hellénique (ND)
PAPADIMOULIS, Dimitrios (Mr./M.)	Member of the Hellenic Parliament Membre du Parlement hellénique (SYRIZA)

³⁴ (CDU: Christian Democratic Union / Union chrétienne démocrate)
(CSU: Christian Social Union / Union chrétienne sociale)
(SPD: Social Democratic Party / Parti social démocrate)
(Die Linke: Left Party / La Gauche)
(Bündnis 90/Grüne: Green Party / Les Verts)

³⁵ (NDC: National Democratic Congress / Congrès démocratique national)
(NPP: New Patriotic Party / Nouveau parti patriotique)

MANIATIS, Ioannis (Mr./M.)	Member of the Hellenic Parliament Membre du Parlement hellénique (PASOK)
MAKRI, Rachil (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the Hellenic Parliament Membre du Parlement hellénique (AE) ³⁶
KARTSAKLI, Katerina (Mrs./Mme) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Head of the Department for the IPU and other International Organizations / Chef du Département de l'UIP et autres organisations internationales

GUINEA-BISSAU – GUINEE-BISSAU

DJALÓ, Ibraima Sori (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the People's National Assembly ad interim Président de l'Assemblée nationale populaire par intérim (PRS)
CASSAMÁ, Almame (Mr./M.)	Member of the People's National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale populaire (PAIGC) ³⁷
SILVA, Orlando (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General / Secrétaire général
DIAS, Fernando Jorge (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Director of Cabinet / Directeur de Cabinet

HAITI

DESRAS, Simon Dieuseul (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	President of the Senate / Président du Sénat
BENOIT, Steven Irvenson (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur
MELIUS, Hyppolite (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur
RICHÉ, Andris (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur
JOSEPH, François Anick (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur
JOSEPH, Jean Ariel (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the Senate Secrétaire général du Sénat
DIORO, Marie Yolette (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	

HUNGARY – HONGRIE

HORVÁTH, János (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (FIDESz)
GRUBER, Attila (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (FIDESz)
MANDUR, László (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly, member of the Committee on Press and Culture / Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Membre de la Commission de la presse et de la culture (MSZP)
GYÖNGYÖSI, Márton (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly, Deputy Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs / Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Vice-Président de la Commission des affaires étrangères (Jobbik)

³⁶ (ND: New Democracy
(SYRIZA: Coalition of the Radical Left
(PASOK: Panhellenic Socialist Movement

/ Nouvelle démocratie)
/ Coalition radicale de gauche)
/ Mouvement socialiste panhellénique
/ Parti des Grecs indépendants)

³⁷ (PRS: Party for Social Renovation
(PAIGC: African Party for the Independence
of Guinea and Cape Verde

/ Parti de la rénovation sociale)
/ Parti africain pour l'indépendance de la Guinée
et du Cap-Vert)

SZILÁGYI, Péter (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (LMP)
LATORCAI, János (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (KDNP)
POTAPI, Arpad (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (FIDESz) ³⁸
SOMFAI ÁDÁM, Katalin (Mrs./Mme) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Senior Councillor of the Office for Foreign Relations Conseillère principale au Bureau des relations extérieures
PORDANY, Laszlo (Mr./M.) Ambassador of Hungary to Canada Ambassadeur de la Hongrie au Canada	

ICELAND – ISLANDE

BACKMAN, Thuridur (Ms./Mme) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Présidente du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Vice-President of the Althingi Vice-Présidente de l'Althingi (LG)
GUDFINNSSON, Einar K. (Mr./M.)	Member of the Althingi / Membre de l'Althingi (IP) ³⁹
BERNÓDUSSON, Helgi (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General / Secrétaire général
BANG, Arna (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation / Secrétaire de la délégation	Adviser on International Affairs Conseillère des affaires étrangères

INDIA – INDE

KUMAR, Meira (Ms./Mme) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Présidente du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Speaker, Lok Sabha / Présidente du Lok Sabha
AIYAR, Mani Shankar (Mr./M.)	Member of the Rajya Sabha / Membre du Rajya Sabha (INC)
JAGANNATH, Mandha (Mr./M.)	Member of the Lok Sabha / Membre du Loka Sabha (INC)
BAJWA, Sardar Partap Singh (Mr./M.)	Member of the Lok Sabha / Membre du Loka Sabha (INC)
PRASAD, Ravi Shankar (Mr./M.)	Member of the Rajya Sabha / Membre du Rajya Sabha (BJP)
BEG, Mehboob (Mr./M.)	Member of the Lok Sabha / Membre du Loka Sabha (J&KNC)
MANI, Jose K. (Mr./M.)	Member of the Lok Sabha / Membre du Lok Sabha (KC-M) ⁴⁰
VISWANATHAN, T.K. (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General, Lok Sabha / Secrétaire général, Lok Sabha
SHERIFF, Shumsher (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General, Rajya Sabha Secrétaire général du Rajya Sabha
SHEKAR, S. Bal (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Additional Secretary, Lok Sabha Secretariat Secrétaire supplémentaire, Secrétariat du Lok Sabha
SAXENA, U.S. (Mr./M.)	Joint Secretary, Lok Sabha Secretariat Co-Secrétaire, Secrétariat du Lok Sabha
SINGH, Shalini (Mrs./Mme)	Private Secretary to the Speaker of the Lok Sabha Secrétaire particulière de la Présidente du Lok Sabha

³⁸ (FIDESz: Hungarian Civic Union / Union civique hongroise)
(MSZP: Hungarian Socialist Party / Parti socialiste hongrois)
(Jobbik: Movement for a Better Hungary / Mouvement pour une meilleure Hongrie)
(LMP: Politics Can Be Different / Faire de la politique autrement)
(KDNP: Christian Democratic People's Party / Parti chrétien-démocrate du peuple)

³⁹ (LG: Left-Green Movement / Mouvement des Verts de la gauche)
(IP: Independence Party / Parti de l'Indépendance)

⁴⁰ (INC: Indian National Congress / Parti du Congrès national indien)
(BJP: Bharatiya Janata Party / Parti Bharatiya Janata)
(J&KNC: Jammu & Kashmir National Conference / Conférence nationale de Jammu et du Cashemire)
(KC-M: Kerala Congress / Congrès du Kerala)

WALIA, N.S. (Mr./M.)	Director, Rajya Sabha Secretariat Directeur, Secrétariat du Rajya Sabha
RAMANA, L.V. (Mr./M.)	Deputy Secretary, Lok Sabha Secretariat Secrétaire adjoint, Secrétariat du Lok Sabha
ANAND, Rakesh (Mr./M.)	Deputy Director, Rajya Sabha Secretariat Directeur adjoint, Secrétariat du Rajya Sabha
BALYAN, K.P. (Mr./M.)	Officer on Special Duty to the Speaker of the Lok Sabha Fonctionnaire en mission spéciale auprès de la Présidente du Lok Sabha
RANA, Kuldeep (Mr./M.)	Protocol Officer, Lok Sabha Secretariat Chargé du protocole au Secrétariat du Lok Sabha
SINGH, Brajesh Kumar (Mr./M.)	Liaison Officer, Lok Sabha Secretariat Chargé de liaison, Secrétariat du Lok Sabha

INDONESIA – INDONESIE

SANTOSO, Priyo Budi (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives Vice-Président de la Chambre des Représentants (PG)
HIDAYAT, Surahman (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives, Chairman of the Inter-Parliamentary Cooperation / Membre de la Chambre des Représentants, Président de la Coopération interparlementaire (PKS)
ISMAN, Hayono (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives, Vice-Chairman of the Inter-Parliamentary Cooperation Membre de la Chambre des Représentants, Vice-Président de la Coopération interparlementaire (PD)
AL SHAMMARI, Sidarto (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives, Vice-Chairman of the Inter-Parliamentary Cooperation Committee Membre de la Chambre des Représentants, Vice-Président de la Commission de la coopération interparlementaire (PDI-P)
CAKRA WIJAYA, Andi Anzhar (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives, Vice-Chairman of the Committee for Inter-Parliamentary Cooperation Membre de la Chambre des Représentants, Vice-Président de la Commission de la coopération interparlementaire (PAN)
NATAWIJANA, Azam Azman (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants
ABENG, Emil (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (PG) ⁴¹
GIRIKOMALA, Raden Elli (Ms./Mme)	Member of the House of Regional Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants régionaux
HASUW, Istibsyaroh (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the House of Regional Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants régionaux
RIANI, Adha (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Regional Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants régionaux
JAJULI, Ahmad (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Member of the House of Regional Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants régionaux
SHALEH, Nining Indra (Mrs./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General / Secrétaire générale
RAJAGUKGUK, Kadir Johnson (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Deputy Secretary General / Secrétaire général adjoint

⁴¹ (PG: Golkar
(PKS: Prosperous Justice Party
(PD: Democrats Party
(PDI-P: Indonesian Democratic Party - Struggle
(PAN: National Mandate Party

/ Parti de la justice et de la prospérité
/ Parti démocrate
/ Parti démocrate indonésien en lutte
/ Parti du mandat national)

HARRIS, Damayanti (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Parliamentary Official / Secrétariat du Parlement
AULAWI, Akhmad (Mr./M.)	Legal Drafter / Rédacteur juridique
ISLAM, Saiful (Mr./M.)	Ministry of Foreign Affairs / Ministère des affaires étrangères
PURBA, Robert Juheng (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	
PURWANTO, Isnu (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	
ZEBUA, Sadarieli (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	
ALFIAH, Warsiti (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP, Secretary to the delegation Membre de l'ASGP, Secrétaire de la délégation	
RUBINI, Nida (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Parliamentary Official / Secrétariat du Parlement
CHANDRA, Purnomo Ahmad (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Ministry of Foreign Affairs / Ministère des affaires étrangères
FIR DAUSY, Arsi (Mr./M.) Adviser (Permanent Mission of Indonesia in Geneva) / Conseiller (Mission permanente de l'Indonésie à Genève)	
MAILANI, Leni (Ms./Mme) Adviser / Conseillère	Parliamentary Expert Staff Experte, Secrétariat du Parlement
BADIB, Ausilinda (Ms./Mme) Interpreter / Interprète	
TANSIL, Yuliana (Ms./Mme) Interpreter / Interprète	

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF) – IRAN (REPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D')

NADIMI, Iraj (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Member of the Islamic Parliament of Iran Membre du Parlement islamique de l'Iran
JALALI, Kazem (Mr./M.) Member of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians / Membre du Comité des droits de l'homme des parlementaires	Member of the Islamic Parliament of Iran Membre du Parlement islamique de l'Iran
NOWROUZI, Rahmatollah (Mr./M.)	Member of the Islamic Parliament of Iran Membre du Parlement islamique de l'Iran
BETKOLYA, Yunaten (Mr./M.)	Member of the Islamic Parliament of Iran Membre du Parlement islamique de l'Iran
PEJMANFAR, Nasrollah (Mr./M.)	Member of the Islamic Parliament of Iran Membre du Parlement islamique de l'Iran
MIRGALOY BAYAT, Shahla (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the Islamic Parliament of Iran Membre du Parlement islamique de l'Iran
GHASSEMPOUR, Amir Abbas (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Senior Expert of the Inter-Parliamentary Secretariat of the Islamic Consultative Assembly / Expert principal du Secrétariat interparlementaire de l'Assemblée consultative islamique
GHASHGHAHI, Mehdi (Mr./M.)	Director, Protocol Department Directeur du Département du protocole

IRAQ

HAMOUDI, Humam Baqir (Mr./M.) Member of the Committee to Promote Respect for International Humanitarian Law, Leader of the delegation / Membre du Comité chargé de promouvoir le respect du droit international humanitaire, Chef de la délégation	Member of the Council of Representatives, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee / Membre du Conseil des Représentants, Président de la Commission des relations étrangères (INA)
IBRAHIM, Nada Mohammad (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
TALEBANI, Ala Tahseen (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Council of Representatives Membre du Conseil des Représentants (KA)
NOSHI, Rafea Abduljabar (Mr./M.)	Member of the Council of Representatives Membre du Conseil des Représentants (INA) ⁴²
NAFTACHY, Zaka Younis (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
AL-RIKABI, Sadiq Hamide (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
MAJID, Ayad Namik (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General / Secrétaire général
RADHI, Mustafa Mohamad (Mr./M.)	Secretary, Foreign Affairs Committee Secrétaire de la Commission des affaires étrangères
MOHAMMAD, Wisam Faisal (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	
AL-HUSSAINI, Abdurahman (Mr./M.) Ambassador of Irak to Canada Ambassadeur de l'Irak au Canada	

IRELAND – IRLANDE

BURKE, Patrick (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of Seanad Éireann Président de Seanad Éireann (FG)
MULHERIN, Michelle (Ms./Mme)	Member of Dáil Éireann / Membre de Dáil Éireann (FG)
WALL, Jack (Mr./M.)	Member of Dáil Éireann / Membre de Dáil Éireann (L)
Ó CLOCHARTAIGH, Trevor (Mr./M.)	Member of Seanad Éireann Membre de Seanad Éireann (SF) ⁴³
DOODY, Bridget (Ms./Mme) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Head of Inter-Parliamentary Affairs Chef des affaires interparlementaires

ISRAEL

SHEETRIT, Meir (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Member of the Knesset Membre de la Knesset (K) ⁴⁴
MELLER-HOROVITZ, Yardena (Mrs./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General / Secrétaire générale

ITALY – ITALIE

CONTINI, Barbara (Ms./Mme) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Senator / Sénatrice (FLI)
LANZARIN, Manuela (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (LNP)

⁴² (INA: National Alliance / Alliance nationale)
(KA: Kurdistan Alliance / Alliance kurde)

⁴³ (FG: Fine Gael / Parti travailliste)
(L: Labour Party)
(SF: Sinn Féin)

⁴⁴ (K: Kadima)

MIGLIORI, Riccardo (Mr./M.)	Member of the Chamber of Deputies Membre de la Chambre des Députés (PdL) ⁴⁵
RADONI, Susanna (Mrs./Mme) Secretary to the delegation / Secrétaire de la délégation	
ACCARRINO, Luisa (Mrs./Mme) Secretary to the ASGP / Secrétaire de l'ASGP	Chamber of Deputies / Chambre des Députés
LASORSA, Antonella (Ms./Mme) Interpreter / Interprète	Chamber of Deputies / Chambre des Députés
OLMEDA, Claudio (Mr./M.) Interpreter / Interprète	Senate / Sénat

JAPAN – JAPON

EDA, Satsuki (Mr./M.) Member of the Governing Council, Leader of the delegation / Membre du Conseil directeur, Chef de la délégation	Member of the House of Councillors Membre de la Chambre des Conseillers (DPJ)
OTANI, Nobumori (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (DPJ)
NAKABAYASHI, Mieko (Ms./Mme) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (DPJ)
SAKAGUCHI, Naoto (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (DPJ)
TANIGAWA, Shuzen (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Councillors Membre de la Chambre des Conseillers (LDP) ⁴⁶
SANO, Keiko (Ms./Mme)	Director, Inter-Parliamentary Relations Division, International Affairs Department, House of Representatives / Directrice de la Division des relations interparlementaires, Département des affaires internationales, Chambre des Représentants
ARAI, Kosumo (Ms./Mme)	Assistant Director, Inter-Parliamentary Relations Division, International Affairs Department, House of Representatives Directrice adjointe de la Division des relations interparlementaires Département des affaires internationales, Chambre des Représentants
NISHIKOBE, Natsuko (Ms./Mme)	Secretary, Inter-Parliamentary Relations Division, International Affairs Department, House of Representatives / Secrétaire de la Division des relations interparlementaires, Département des affaires internationales, Chambre des Représentants
SUGIYAMA, Jin (Mr./M.)	Secretary, Inter-Parliamentary Relations Division, International Affairs Department, House of Representatives / Secrétaire de la Division des relations interparlementaires, Département des affaires internationales, Chambre des Représentants
SHIMIZU, Ken (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Director, International Conferences Division, International Affairs Department, House of Councillors / Directeur de la Division des conférences internationales, Département des affaires internationales, Chambre des Conseillers
SUZUKI, Yuko (Ms./Mme)	Assistant Director, International Conferences Division, International Affairs Department, House of Councillors Directrice adjointe de la Division des conférences internationales, Département des affaires internationales, Chambre des Conseillers

⁴⁵ (FLI: Futuro e Libertà per l'Italia
(LNP: North League Piedmont
(PdL: People of Freedom

/ Ligue du nord Piémont)
/ Peuple de la liberté)

⁴⁶ (DPJ: Democratic Party of Japan
(LDP: Liberal Democratic Party

/ Parti démocrate japonais)
/ Parti libéral démocrate)

HIBI, Norio (Mr./M.)

Secretary, International Affairs Department, House of
Councillors / Secrétaire du Département des affaires
internationales de la Chambre des ConseillersSEYMOUR, Reiko (Ms./Mme)
Interpreter / InterprèteLUMPKIN, Tomoko (Ms./Mme)
Interpreter / InterprèteBOND, Chieko (Ms./Mme)
Interpreter / InterprèteGRAHAM, Ikumi (Ms./Mme)
Interpreter / InterprèteESAKA, Yumi (Ms./Mme)
Interpreter / InterprèteSHIMIZU, Kazuko (Ms./Mme)
Interpreter / InterprèteKONDO, Mieko (Ms./Mme)
Interpreter / InterprèteSATO, Fujiko (Ms./Mme)
Interpreter / InterprèteGALE, Terumi (Ms./Mme)
Interpreter / Interprète**JORDAN – JORDANIE**RAWABDEH, Abdr-Rauf (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Vice-President of the Senate / Vice-Président du Sénat

BILTAJI, Moh'd Akel (Mr./M.)

Senator / Sénateur

HAJ HASAN, Samar (Mrs./Mme)

Senator / Sénatrice

NAZZAL, Michael (Mr./M.)

Senator / Sénateur

KREISHAN, Mohammad (Mr./M.)

Senator / Sénateur

AL RUDAINI, Mohammed (Mr./M.)

Secretary General of the House of Representatives
Secrétaire général de la Chambre des ReprésentantsALMASHAKBEH, Adnan (Mr./M.)
Secretary to the delegation
Secrétaire de la délégationHead of the Public Relations Department, Senate
Chef du Département des relations publiques du SénatQALLAB, Maen (Mr./M.)
Secretary to the delegation
Secrétaire de la délégation

AL HAMMOURI, Yahya (Mr./M.)

Staff / Secrétariat

KAZAKHSTAN

NIGMATULIN, Nurlan (Mr./M.)

Speaker of the Mazhilis / Président du Mazhilis (Nur Otan)

ASHYMBAYEV, Maulen (Mr./M.)

Member of the Mazhilis, Committee Chairman
Membre du Mazhilis, Président de commission (Nur Otan)

TARASSENKO, Yelena (Mrs./Mme)

Member of the Mazhilis / Membre du Mazhilis (Nur Otan)

SOROKIN, Boris (Mr./M.)

Member of the Mazhilis / Membre du Mazhilis

ZHYLKYSHIYEV, Bolat (Mr./M.)

Senator, Chairman of the Committee on Environment and
Rural Development / Sénateur, Président de la Commission
de l'environnement et du développement rural

BEKBANOVA, Zhanar (Mrs./Mme)

Deputy Secretary General of the Mazhilis
Secrétaire générale adjointe du Mazhilis

MAKHAYEV, Dastan (Mr./M.)	Head of the Speaker's Secretariat Chef du Secrétariat du Président
KASSYMBEKOV, Talgat (Mr./M.)	Head of the International Affairs and Protocol Department Chef du Département des affaires internationales et du protocole
MEDEUBAY, Darkhan (Mr./M.)	Deputy Head of the International Affairs and Protocol Department / Chef adjoint du Département des affaires internationales et du protocole
TUREKHANOV, Bagdaulet (Mr./M.)	Senior Expert of the International Affairs and Protocol Department / Expert principal du Département des affaires internationales et du protocole
SMAGULOV, Nurlan (Mr./M.) Security Officer / Agent de sécurité	Head of Personal Security to the Speaker Chef de la sécurité du Président
SHAIKHIN, Yertai (Mr./M.) Security Officer / Agent de sécurité	
LOSSEV, Valentin (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	

KENYA

MAALIM, Farah Mohamed (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly Vice-Président de l'Assemblée nationale (ODM) ⁴⁷
MUSILA, David (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
BWIRE, Alfred (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
ABDALLA, Shakila (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
GICHOHI, Patrick Gichuru (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Clerk / Secrétaire général
ADJIBODUE, Marya (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Clerk Assistant / Secrétaire générale adjointe
ADIKA, Peter (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	

**LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC
REPUBLIQUE DEMOCRATIQUE POPULAIRE LAO**

PHENGKHAMMY, Somphan (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Vice-President of the National Assembly Vice-Président de l'Assemblée nationale
BOUPHA, Bounngong (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly, Deputy Chairperson of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Chairperson of the Women Parliamentarians Caucus / Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Vice-Présidente de la Commission des affaires étrangères, Présidente du Groupe des femmes parlementaires
THEPHACHANH, Viengthavisone (Mr./M.)	Director General of the Foreign Affairs Department Directeur général du Département des affaires étrangères
THEPBOUALY, Khaymarninh (Mr./M.)	Secretary to the Vice-President / Secrétaire du Vice-Président

⁴⁷ (ODM: Orange Democratic Movement Party of Kenya / Mouvement démocratique orange)

LATVIA – LETTONIE

MIRSKIS, Sergejs (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Member of the Saeima, Vice-Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee / Membre du Saeima, Vice-Président de la Commission des affaires étrangères (CC) ⁴⁸
DRUVIETE, Ina (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Saeima / Membre du Saeima
VEJONIS, Raimonds (Mr./M.)	Member of the Saeima / Membre du Saeima
NAUDINS, Romans (Mr./M.)	Member of the Saeima / Membre du Saeima
PAURA, Sandra (Mrs./Mme) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Head of the Inter-Parliamentary Relations Bureau Chef du Département des relations interparlementaires

LESOTHO

MOTANYANE, Sephiri (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale
MATHABA, Kimetso (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly, Chairperson of the Natural Resources Committee / Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Président de la Commission des ressources naturelles (NIP) ⁴⁹
MOHASOA, Malephallo (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	

LIBYA – LIBYE

ATAIGHA, Giuma (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Deputy Speaker of the General National Congress Vice-Président du Congrès général national
ABDUALLAH, Fawzi (Mr./M.)	Member of the General National Congress Membre du Congrès général national
GANOUR, Suad (Ms./Mme)	Member of the General National Congress Membre du Congrès général national
ALMNFY, Mohamed (Mr./M.)	Member of the General National Congress Membre du Congrès général national
IBRAHIM, Saad (Mr./M.)	Member of the General National Congress Membre du Congrès général national
ABDULSADIG, Awad (Mr./M.)	Member of the General National Congress Membre du Congrès général national
ABUSAHMIN, Nuri (Mr./M.)	Member of the General National Congress Membre du Congrès général national
ABUFAED, Idris (Mr./M.)	Member of the General National Congress Membre du Congrès général national
IBRAHIM, Amina (Ms./Mme) Adviser / Conseillère	Member of the General National Congress Membre du Congrès général national
ALHASSADI, Taha Nagib (Mr./M.)	Office Manager to the Deputy Speaker Directeur du Bureau du Vice-Président
AZOUZ, Omaro (Mr./M.)	Media Director / Directeur des médias
ZAID, Khalid (Mr./M.)	Coordinator / Coordinateur
WALID, Majddin (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	

⁴⁸ (CC: Concord Centre

/ Centre concorde)

⁴⁹ (NIP: National Independent Party

/ Parti national indépendant)

DAHAN, Khaled (Mr./M.)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation
Ministère des affaires étrangères et de la coopération
internationale

HIBANY, Mansur (Mr./M.)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation
Ministère des affaires étrangères et de la coopération
internationaleMAKHLUF, Hesham (Mr./M.)
Security Officer / Agent de sécuritéHAWHEEL, Mohamed (Mr./M.)
Security Officer / Agent de sécuritéMURAD, Amin (Mr./M.)
Embassy of Libya to Canada
Ambassade de la Libye au CanadaMOHAMMED, Sulaiman (Mr./M.)
Embassy of Libya to Canada
Ambassade de la Libye au CanadaHUUWISA, Hesham (Mr./M.)
Embassy of Libya to Canada
Ambassade de la Libye au CanadaALMANSOURI, Abdelaziz (Mr./M.)
Embassy of Libya to Canada
Ambassade de la Libye au Canada**LIECHTENSTEIN**BECK, Jürgen (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégationMember of the Parliament (Landtag)
Membre du Parlement (Landtag) (VU)

FROMMELT, Doris (Ms./Mme)

Member of the Parliament (Landtag)
Membre du Parlement (Landtag) (FBP) ⁵⁰HILTI, Josef (Mr./M.)
Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du GroupeSecretary General of the Landtag
Secrétaire général du Landtag**LITHUANIA – LITUANIE**ALEKSONIS, Gedeminas (Mr./M.)
Chef de la délégation

Member of the Seimas / Membre du Seimas

TEISERSKYTE, Dalia (Ms./Mme)

Member of the Seimas / Membre du Seimas

SUMSKIENE, Laura (Ms./Mme)
Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du GroupeAdviser, International Relations Department
Conseillère du Département des relations internationales**LUXEMBOURG**MUTSCH, Lydia (Mrs./Mme)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégationDeputy Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies
Vice-Présidente de la Chambre des Députés (LSAP)

BAUSCH, François (Mr./M.)

Member of the Chamber of Deputies, Chairman of
the Committee on Parliamentary Control of the State
Information Service / Membre de la Chambre des
Députés, Président de la Commission de contrôle
parlementaire du Service de renseignement de l'Etat
(Déi Gréng) ⁵¹

⁵⁰ (VU: Patriotic Union
(FBP: Progressive Citizens' Party/ Union patriotique)
/ Parti des citoyens progressistes)⁵¹ (LSAP: Socialist Party
(Déi Gréng: Greens/ Parti socialiste)
/ Les verts)

MALAWI

MPHANDE, Juliana (Mrs./Mme) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Second Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly Deuxième Vice-Présidente de l'Assemblée nationale (DPP)
MWALE, Theresa (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (DPP)
JANGIYA, Mwalone (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (UDF) ⁵²
MWENYEHELI, Jeffrey (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Principal Clerk / Greffier principal
GONDWE, Dennis (Mr./M.) Desk Officer / Assistant	Committee Clerk / Greffier de commission

MALAYSIA – MALAISIE

LIEW, Vui Keong (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Member of the House of Representatives, Deputy Minister at the Prime Minister's Department / Membre de la Chambre des Représentants, Vice-Ministre au Département du Premier Ministre
BRODI, Doris Sophia (Mrs./Mme)	Vice-President of the Senate / Vice-Présidente du Sénat (PRS)
WEE, Ka Siong (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives, Deputy Minister of Education / Membre de la Chambre des Représentants, Vice-Ministre de l'éducation (BN-MCA) ⁵³
KOK, Yuk Ken (Mr./M.)	Secretary / Secrétaire
LIM, Ching Hao (Mr./M.)	Secretary / Secrétaire
ZAMRIZAM, Samsuri (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group and to the delegation Secrétaire du Groupe et de la délégation	

MALDIVES

NAZIM, Ahmed (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Deputy Speaker of the People's Majlis Vice-Président du Majlis des Citoyens
ABDULLA, Eva (Ms./Mme)	Member of the People's Majlis Membre du Majlis des Citoyens
ABDUL GHAFUOR, Hamid (Mr./M.)	Member of the People's Majlis Membre du Majlis des Citoyens
HUSSAIN MANIK, Ahmed Nihan (Mr./M.)	Member of the People's Majlis Membre du Majlis des Citoyens
RIZA, Ibrahim (Mr./M.)	Member of the People's Majlis Membre du Majlis des Citoyens
SALEEM, Ali (Mr./M.)	Member of the People's Majlis Membre du Majlis des Citoyens
MOHAMED, Ahmed (Mr./M.)	Secretary General / Secrétaire général
BADHREE, Zuyyna (Ms./Mme)	Foreign Relations Officer Chargée des relations étrangères

⁵² (DPP: Democratic Progressive Party

(UDF: United Democratic Front

⁵³ (BN: National Front

(MCA: Malaysian Chinese Association

/ Parti démocratique progressiste)

/ Front démocratique unifié)

/ Front national)

/ Association sino-malaisienne)

MALI

TAPO, Kassoum (Mr./M.)
President of the Committee on the Human Rights
of parliamentarians, Leader of the delegation
Président du Comité des droits de l'homme
des parlementaires, Chef de la délégation

Fourth Vice-President of the National Assembly
Quatrième Vice-Président de l'Assemblée nationale

NIANGADOU, Hadi (Mr./M.)

Eighth Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly
Huitième Vice-Président de l'Assemblée nationale (CNID)

HAIDARA, El Hadji Baba (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (ACM)

DIANESSY, Ibrahima (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly, First Parliamentary
Secretary / Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Premier
Secrétaire parlementaire (URD) ⁵⁴

TOURÉ, Mamoutou (Mr./M.)
Financial Administrative Secretary
Secrétaire administratif financier

MEXICO – MEXIQUE

CUEVAS, Gabriela (Ms./Mme)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Senator, Chairperson of the Committee on International
Affairs / Sénatrice, Présidente de la Commission des
affaires internationales (PAN) ⁵⁵

ENRIQUEZ BALDAZO, Areli (Ms./Mme)
Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe

Director, International Affairs
Directrice des affaires internationales

**MICRONESIA (FEDERATED STATES OF)
MICRONESIE (ETATS FEDERES DE)**

FIGIR, Isaac V. (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Speaker of the Congress / Président du Congrès

YOSIWO, George P. (Mr./M.)

Member of the Congress, Deputy Chairman of the
Committee on Resources and Development, Deputy
Chairman of the Committee on Health and Social Affairs
Membre du Congrès, Vice-Président de la Commission
des ressources et du développement, Vice-Président de
la Commission de la santé et des affaires sociales

PANUELO, David W. (Mr./M.)

Member of the Congress, Chairman of the Committee
on Judiciary and Governmental Operations / Membre
du Congrès, Président de la Commission des opérations
judiciaires et gouvernementales

IOANIS, Liwiana Ramon (Mrs./Mme)
Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe

Chief Clerk / Secrétaire générale

PINKNEY-BAIRD, Jonathan L. (Mr./M.)

Staff Attorney, Office of the Legislative Counsel
Chargé de recherches au Bureau des Conseillers législatifs

⁵⁴ (CNID: Democratic Initiative National Congress of Mali
(ACM: Alliance pour la Consolidation de la Majorité
(URD: Republic and Democracy Union

/ Congrès national d'initiative démocratique du Mali)
(Alliance for the Consolidation of the Majority)
(Union pour la République et la démocratie)
⁵⁵ (PAN: National Action Party
/ Parti de l'Action nationale)

MONGOLIA – MONGOLIE

BAYARTSOGT, Sangajav (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

YONDON, Otgonbayar (Mr./M.)

ZALAA-UUL, Tundevdorj (Mr./M.)
Ambassador of Mongolia to Canada
Ambassadeur de la Mongolie au Canada

GANBOLD, Dambajav (Mr./M.)
Embassy of Mongolia to Canada
Ambassade de la Mongolie au Canada

Vice-Chairman of the State Great Hural
Vice-Président du Grand Khoural de l'Etat

Member of the State Great Hural
Membre du Grand Khoural de l'Etat

MOROCCO – MAROC

GHELLAB, Karim (Mr./M.)
Member of the Governing Council, Leader of
the delegation / Membre du Conseil directeur,
Chef de la délégation

EL ANSARI, Abdelouahed (Mr./M.)

KOUSKOUS, Hamid (Mr./M.)

OMARI, Abdelaziz (Mr./M.)

BENMASSAOUD, Rachida (Ms./Mme)
Member of the Governing Council
Membre du Conseil directeur

BOUAYAD, Zoubida (Mrs./Mme)
Member of the Governing Council
Membre du Conseil directeur

LAZRAK, Noureddine (Mr./M.)

LAABIDI, Rachid (Mr./M.)

TOUIZI, Ahmed (Mr./M.)
Adviser / Conseiller

EL ANSARI, Mohamed (Mr./M.)
Adviser / Conseiller

CHRAIBI, Azzedine (Mr./M.)

ALAOUI BELGHITI, Mohamed (Mr./M.)

IBDELHAJ, Hafida (Ms./Mme)
Administrative Secretary of the Group
Secrétaire administrative du Groupe

DRIOUCHE, Abdelwahad (Mr./M.)
Secretary to the delegation
Secrétaire de la délégation

Speaker of the House of Representatives
Président de la Chambre des Représentants

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants

Member of the House of Councillors
Membre de la Chambre des Conseillers (PAM)

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (PI)

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (USFP)

Member of the House of Councillors
Membre de la Chambre des Conseillers (USFP)

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (RNI)

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (PAM)

Member of the House of Councillors
Membre de la Chambre des Conseillers (PAM)⁵⁶

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants

Head of the Office of the Speaker of the House of
Representatives / Chef du Cabinet du Président de
la Chambre des Représentants

Adviser to the Speaker of the House of Representatives
Conseiller du Président de la Chambre des Représentants

Head, Division of External Relations and Cooperation,
House of Representatives / Chef de la Division des
relations extérieures et de la coopération de la
Chambre des Représentants

Head of External Relations Division, House of Councillors
Chef de la Division des relations extérieures de la Chambre
des Conseillers

⁵⁶ (PAM: Authenticity and Modernity Party
(PI: Istiqlal
(USFP: Socialist Union of Popular Forces

/ Parti authenticité et modernité
/ Parti de l'Istiqlal
/ Union socialiste de forces populaires)

MOZAMBIQUE

MIGUEL, Maria Josefa (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the Assembly of the Republic Membre de l'Assemblée de la République (FRELIMO)
CINQUENTA NAULA, Mario (Mr./M.)	Member of the Assembly of the Republic Membre de l'Assemblée de la République (RENAMO) ⁵⁷
BONIFÁCIO, César João (Mr./M.) Assistant Secretary of the Group Secrétaire adjoint du Groupe	Director, Standing Committees Division Directeur de la Division des commissions permanentes

MYANMAR

KYAW SWA, Nanda (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives Vice-Président de la Chambre des Représentants
NAUNG, Win (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Nationalities Membre de la Chambre des Nationalités
CHAN, Mi Yin (Ms./Mme)	Member of the House of Nationalities Membre de la Chambre des Nationalités
THAN, Htwe (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	

NAMIBIA – NAMIBIE

KAPERER, Asser Kuveri (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Chairman of the National Council Président du Conseil national (SWAPO)
MENSAH-WILLIAMS, Margaret (Mrs./Mme)	Vice-Chairperson of the National Council Vice-Présidente du Conseil national (SWAPO)
AMWEELO, Moses (Mr./M.) Vice-President of the Group Vice-Président du Groupe	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (SWAPO)
MUREMI, Nimrod (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (SWAPO)
GAOBAEB, Hendrik (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (UDF)
MAKGONE, Silvia (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (SWAPO)
LUCKS, Heiko (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (RDP) ⁵⁸
SHIMUTWIKENI, Panduleni (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP, Secretary of the Group Membre de l'ASGP, Secrétaire du Groupe	Secretary General of the National Council Secrétaire générale du Conseil national
JACOBS, Johannes Jakes (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary, National Assembly Secrétaire à l'Assemblée nationale
ISAAK, Willem H. (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Senior Parliamentary Clerk, National Assembly Fonctionnaire parlementaire principal, Assemblée nationale
UIRAB, Simon (Mr./M.)	Special Assistant to the Speaker Assistant particulier du Président
SHALI, Auguste (Mrs./Mme) Co-Secretary of the Group Co-Secrétaire du Groupe	Parliamentary Clerk, Committee Services, National Council / Greffière parlementaire, Service des Commissions du Conseil national

⁵⁷ (FRELIMO: Mozambican Liberation Front

(RENAMO: Mozambican National Resistance

⁵⁸ (SWAPO: South West Africa People's Organization

(UDF: United Democratic Front of Namibia

(RDP: Rally for Democracy and Progress

/ Front de libération du Mozambique)

/ Résistance nationale du Mozambique)

/ Organisation du peuple du Sud-Ouest africain)

/ Front démocratique unifié)

/ Rassemblement pour la démocratie et le progrès)

NAKUTWIMA, Mirjam (Ms./Mme)

Private Secretary to the Vice-Chairperson
Secrétaire particulière de la Vice-Présidente

HIMUVI, Mbingeneeko (Mr./M.)

Special Assistant to the Chairman of the National Council
Assistant spécial du Président du Conseil national

ANDJABA, Martin (Mr./M.)

High Commissioner of Namibia to Canada
Haut Commissaire de la Namibie au Canada

SIMASIKU, Obrien (Mr./M.)

High Commission of Namibia to Canada
Haut Commissariat de la Namibie au Canada**NETHERLANDS – PAYS-BAS**

PUTTERS, Kim (Mr./M.)

President of the Group, Leader of the delegation
Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégationMember of the Senate of the States General
Membre du Sénat des Etats généraux (PvdA)

DIJKHOFF, Klaas (Mr./M.)

Member of the House of Representatives of the States
General / Membre de la Chambre des Représentants
des Etats généraux (VVD)⁵⁹

HAMILTON, Geert Jan (Mr./M.)

Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP

Secretary General of the Senate of the States General
Secrétaire général du Sénat des Etats généraux

BAKKER, Henk (Mr./M.)

Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP

Deputy Secretary General of the House of Representatives
of the States General / Secrétaire général adjoint de la
Chambre des Représentants des Etats généraux

NIEUWENHUIZEN, Bas (Mr./M.)

Secretary to the delegation
Secrétaire de la délégationHead of the Inter-Parliamentary Relations Office
Chef du Bureau des relations interparlementaires**NEW ZEALAND – NOUVELLE-ZELANDE**

HENARE, Tau (Mr./M.)

Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Member of the House of Representatives, Chairman of
the Committee on Maori Affairs / Membre de la Chambre
des Représentants, Président de la Commission des
affaires maori (NP)

GENTER, Julie Anne (Ms./Mme)

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (G)

O'CONNOR, Damien Peter (Mr./M.)

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (L)⁶⁰

TAYLOR, Averil (Ms./Mme)

Secretary to the delegation
Secrétaire de la délégation

Parliamentary Officer / Secrétariat

NICARAGUA

SUÁREZ, Jacinto (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly, Chairman of the
Committee on Foreign Affairs / Membre de l'Assemblée
nationale, Président de la Commission des affaires étrangères

⁵⁹ (PvdA: Labour Party
(VVD: Liberal Party/ Parti travailliste)
/ Parti libéral)⁶⁰ (NP: National Party
(G: Green Party
(L: Labour Party/ Parti national)
/ Les verts)
/ Parti travailliste)

NIGER

HABIBOU, Aminatou (Ms./Mme) Vice-President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Vice-Présidente du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PNDS)
MAÏ ZOUMBOU, Laoual Amadou (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (MNSD)
IBRONA-ALLA, Aoua (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PNDS) ⁶¹
SABO, Boubacar (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Deputy Secretary General / Secrétaire général adjoint
NASSIBIDO, Mamoudou (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Director, International Relations and Protocol Directeur des relations internationales et du protocole

NIGERIA

MARK, David (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	President of the Senate / Président du Sénat (PDP)
IHEDIOHA, Chukwuemeka Nkem (Mr./M.) Deputy Leader of the delegation Chef adjoint de la délégation	Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives Vice-Président de la Chambre des Représentants (PDP)
USMAN, Abdulaziz (Mr./M.)	Senator, Chairman of the Committee on Parliamentary Affairs / Sénateur, Président de la Commission des affaires parlementaires (PDP)
BARATA, Ahmed Hassan (Mr./M.)	Senator, Chairman of the Committee on Culture, Tourism and National Orientation / Sénateur, Président de la Commission de la culture, du tourisme et de l'orientation nationale (PDP)
ESUENE, Helen (Ms./Mme)	Senator, Chairperson of the Committee on Women Affairs and Youth Development / Sénatrice, Présidente de la Commission des affaires féminines et du développement de la jeunesse (PDP)
UZAMERE, Ehigie Edobor (Mr./M.)	Senator, Chairman of the Committee on Local and Foreign Debts / Sénateur, Président de la Commission de la dette locale et étrangère (ACN)
GARBA, A.A. Doguwa (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives, Chairman of the Committee on MDG / Membre de la Chambre des Représentants, Président de la Commission des OMD (PDP)
BELLO, Maigari Binta (Ms./Mme)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (PDP)
IGBOKWE, Raphael Nnana (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (PDP)
AJAYI, Adeyinka (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (ACN)
IDRIS Sani, Mohammed (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (PDP) ⁶²
EFETURI, Ben (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Clerk of the Senate / Secrétaire général du Sénat
AKUNWAFOR, Cordelia Ogugua (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	
GARBA, Lawal (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Deputy Director / Directeur adjoint

⁶¹ (PNDS: Niger Party for Democracy and Socialism / Parti nigérien pour la démocratie et le socialisme)
(MNSD: National Movement for the Development Society / Mouvement national pour la société du développement)

⁶² (PDP: People's Democratic Party / Parti démocratique populaire)
(ACN: Action Congress of Nigeria / Congrès du Nigéria pour l'action)

ISAH, Ibrahim (Mr./M.)	Foreign Affairs Officer / Chargé des affaires étrangères
ASHIEKAA, Christopher (Mr./M.)	Special Assistant to the Clerk of the National Assembly Assistant spécial du Secrétaire général de l'Assemblée nationale
NDIWE, Arthur (Mr./M.)	Director of Protocol, Senate / Directeur du protocole au Sénat
GHALI ABDULHAMID, Mohammed (Mr./M.)	Special Adviser, Political Issues Conseiller spécial sur les questions politiques
UKOHA, David (Mr./M.) Personal Physician / Médecin particulier	
OLUGBONDIYAN, Kola (Mr./M.)	Special Adviser, Media / Conseiller spécial des médias
OKE EPIA, Edward (Mr./M.)	Chief Press Secretary to the Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives / Secrétaire en chef des médias auprès du Vice-Président de la Chambre des Représentants
BADAMASI, Abubakar (Mr./M.)	Committee Clerk / Greffier de commission
MARK, Igoche (Mr./M.)	Personal Assistant to the President of the Senate Assistant particulier du Président du Sénat
OSEKE, Augustine (Mr./M.)	Accompanying Official / Fonctionnaire
AUDU, Rabi Ada (Ms./Mme)	Accompanying Official / Fonctionnaire
ESEKE, Augustine (Ms./Mme)	Accompanying Official / Fonctionnaire
ABUBAKAR, Mohammed Kudu (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	
ANIAGWU, Charles Ehiedu (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	
BUKAR, Hussein (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	
ADISA, Taiwo (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	
FOLASADE KOYI, Adelulu (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	
OJIABOR, Onyechi (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	
NZESHI, Onwuka (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	
TURAKI, Hassan (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	
IBEH, Chuks (Mr./M.) Aide de camp	
MIRI, Abel (Mr./M.) Aide de camp	
ZWALCHIR, Abel (Mr./M.) Security Officer / Agent de sécurité	

NORWAY – NORVEGE

HEGGØ, Ingrid (Ms./Mme) Member of the Governing Council, Leader of the delegation / Membre du Conseil directeur, Chef de la délégation	Member of the Storting / Membre du Storting (LP)
VAKSDAL, Øyvind (Mr./M.) Member of the Governing Council, Deputy Leader of the delegation / Membre du Conseil directeur, Chef adjoint de la délégation	Member of the Storting / Membre du Storting (PP)
GUNDERSEN, Gunnar (Mr./M.) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Member of the Storting / Membre du Storting (CP)

WICKHOLM, Truls (Mr./M.)	Member of the Storting / Membre du Storting (LP) ⁶³
DAHL HOTVEDT, Bjørnar (Mr./M.) Adviser to the delegation / Conseiller de la délégation	
HØGE, Anne Laila (Ms./Mme) Secretary of the Group and to the delegation Secrétaire du Groupe et de la délégation	Senior Executive Officer / Administratrice principale

OMAN

AL-MAJALI, Abdullah (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Deputy Speaker of the Majles A'Shura Vice-Président du Majles A'Shura
AL-KHARUSIYA, Nasheia (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the Majles Addawla Membre du Majles Addawla
AL-HARTHIYA, Aseela (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the Majles Addawla Membre du Majles Addawla
AL-BURAIKI, Sultan Rashid Said (Mr./M.)	Member of the Majles A'Shurah Membre du Majles A'Shura
AL-SHAMSI, Rashed (Mr./M.)	Member of the Majles A'Shurah Membre du Majles A'Shura
AL MAHRI, Maktoom (Mr./M.)	Member of the Majles A'Shurah Membre du Majles A'Shura
ALSA'IDI, Hilal (Mr./M.)	Official / Secrétariat
AL FARSI, Marshal (Mr./M.)	Official / Secrétariat

PAKISTAN

HUSSAIN BOKHARI, Syed Nayyer (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Chairman of the Senate / Président du Sénat
KHAWAJA, Karim Ahmed (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur
MIRANI, Aftab Shahaban (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
MALANI, Mahesh Kumar (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
JUNEJO, Fiza (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
GOHAR, Bushra (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
SALAH-UD-DIN, Sheikh (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
MIR, Muhammad Sajid (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur
SHAHI, Syed (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur
BABAR, Iftikharullah (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary, Senate / Secrétaire au Sénat
KHOKHER, Aftab Ahmad (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Joint Secretary, Senate / Co-Secrétaire au Sénat
HAIDER, Syed Hasnain (Mr./M.)	Joint Secretary, Senate / Co-Secrétaire au Sénat
MALIK, Humayun (Mr./M.)	Deputy Director of Protocol Directeur adjoint du protocole

⁶³ (LP: Labour Party
(PP: Progress Party
(CP: Conservative Party

/ Parti travailliste)
(PP: progressiste)
(CP: conservateur)

PALESTINE

AL-ZANOON, Saleem (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the Palestine National Council Président du Conseil national palestinien
AL-WAZIR, Intisar (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Palestine National Council Membre du Conseil national palestinien
ABDALLAH, Abdallah (Mr./M.)	Member of the Palestine National Council Membre du Conseil national palestinien
MELHEM, Mustafa (Mr./M.)	Member of the Palestine National Council Membre du Conseil national palestinien
SANDUKA, Zuhair (Mr./M.)	Member of the Palestine National Council Membre du Conseil national palestinien
HAMAD, Said (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	
HAMED, Omar (Mr./M.)	Director, Media Department Directeur du Département des médias
IRSHEID, Mohammed (Mr./M.)	Administrative Assistant / Assistant administratif

PANAMA

CASTAÑEDA, Dana (Ms./Mme) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Second Vice-President of the National Assembly Deuxième Vice-Présidente de l'Assemblée nationale (CD)
SALERNO, Noriel (Mr./M.)	Member of the Legislative Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée législative (CD)
FRIAS, Ruben (Mr./M.)	Member of the Legislative Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée législative
CASTILLO, Elías (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PRD) ⁶⁴
ZAPATA, César (Mr./M.)	Staff / Secrétariat
GOMEZ, Maria de Jesus (Ms./Mme)	Staff / Secrétariat

PARAGUAY

CABALLERO FIORIO, Carlos Roger (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur
RIVERO VAZQUEZ, Rildo (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	

PERU – PEROU

SIMON, Yehude (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Member of the Congress of the Republic Membre du Congrès de la République (PHP) ⁶⁵
--	--

⁶⁴ (CD: Democratic Change
(PRD: Democratic Revolutionary Party

/ Changement démocratique)
/ Parti révolutionnaire démocratique)

⁶⁵ (PHP: Partido Humanista Peruano)

PHILIPPINES

DRILON, Franklin (Mr./M.) Member of the Executive Committee, Member of the Governing Council, Leader of the delegation Membre du Comité exécutif, Membre du Conseil directeur, Chef de la délégation	Senator, Chairman of the Committee on Finance Sénateur, Président de la Commission des finances
ANGARA, Edgardo (Mr./M.) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Senator / Sénateur
GUINGONA III, Teofisto (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur
CAYETANO, Pia (Ms./Mme)	Senator / Sénatrice
FARIÑAS, Rodolfo (Mr./M.) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (NP)
QUIMBO, Romero Federico (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (LP)
MENDOZA, Joselito (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (LP)
COLMENARES, Neri (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (BM)
PANGILINAN, Francis (Mr./M.) Substitute Member of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians / Membre suppléant du Comité des droits de l'homme des parlementaires	Senator / Sénateur
MARCOS, Ferdinand Jr. (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Senator / Sénateur
ANGPING, Maria Zenaida (Ms./Mme) Adviser / Conseillère	Member of the House of Representatives, Deputy Chairperson of the Committee on Inter-Parliamentary Relations and Diplomacy / Membre de la Chambre des Représentants, Vice-Présidente de la Commission des relations interparlementaires et de la diplomatie (NPC) ⁶⁶
LIRIO-REYES, Emma (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the Senate Secrétaire générale du Sénat
BARUA-YAP, Marilyn (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the House of Representatives Secrétaire générale de la Chambre des Représentants
De GUZMAN, Antonio Jr. (Mr./M.) Adviser, Secretary of the Group Conseiller, Secrétaire du Groupe	Director General / Directeur général
DE CHAVEZ, Cesar (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Director, Senate / Directeur au Sénat
OCTAVO, Riza (Ms./Mme) Assistant Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire adjointe de la délégation	Legislative Staff Officer, Senate Secrétariat des Services législatifs du Sénat
BUENDIA, Efren (Mr./M.) Assistant Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire adjoint de la délégation	Legislative Staff Officer, Senate Secrétariat des Services législatifs du Sénat
DUMAS, Apryll J.T. (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Deputy Executive Director, Office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives / Sous-Directrice exécutive du Bureau du Président de la Chambre des Représentants

⁶⁶ (NP: Nationalist Party
(LP: Liberal Party
(NPC: Nationalist People's Coalition

/ Parti nationaliste)
/ Parti libéral)
/ Coalition populaire nationaliste)

GONZALVO-AMARANTO, Sherry (Ms./Mme) Assistant Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire adjointe de la délégation	Director, Office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives / Directrice du Bureau du Président de la Chambre des Représentants
SANTOS-ROA, Margarita (Ms./Mme) Assistant Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire adjointe de la délégation	Executive Director / Directrice exécutive
BALAJADIA, Jose (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Sergeant-at-Arms / Huissier
MARK YEE, Karol (Ms./Mme)	Executive Assistant / Assistante de direction
MARTINEZ, Theresa I. (Ms./Mme)	Undersecretary, Department of Tourism Sous-Secrétaire du Département du tourisme
CAJIGAL, Evelyn R. (Ms./Mme)	Director, Department of Tourism Directrice du Département du tourisme
GATAN, Leslie (Mr./M.) Ambassador of the Philippines to Canada Ambassadeur des Philippines au Canada	
MAYO, Porfirio (Mr./M.) Embassy of the Philippines to Canada Ambassade des Philippines au Canada	
MAYO, Florida Ann Camille (Ms./Mme) Embassy of the Philippines to Canada Ambassade des Philippines au Canada	
MORENO, Miguel Luis (Mr./M.) Embassy of the Philippines to Canada Ambassade des Philippines au Canada	
SUMO, Ronnie (Mr./M.) Embassy of the Philippines to Canada Ambassade des Philippines au Canada	
HOLLMANN, Charmaine (Ms./Mme) Embassy of the Philippines to Canada Ambassade des Philippines au Canada	
PATAUNIA, Edna (Ms./Mme) Embassy of the Philippines to Canada Ambassade des Philippines au Canada	
ILAGAN, Jerome (Mr./M.) Embassy of the Philippines to Canada Ambassade des Philippines au Canada	

POLAND – POLOGNE

BUKIEWICZ, Bozenna (Ms./Mme) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Présidente du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Member of the Sejm / Membre du Sejm (PO)
KALISZ, Ryszard (Mr./M.)	Member of the Sejm / Membre du Sejm (SLD)
MAZUREK, Beata (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Sejm / Membre du Sejm (PiS)
ZIÓLKOWSKI, Marek (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur (PO)
KLOC, Izabela (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Sejm / Membre du Sejm (PiS)
RACZKOWSKI, Damian (Mr./M.)	Member of the Sejm / Membre du Sejm (PO)
SEWERYNSKI, Michal (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur (PiS) ⁶⁷
CZAPLA, Lech (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the Sejm / Secrétaire général du Sejm

⁶⁷ (PO: Civic Platform
(SLD: Democratic Left Alliance
(PiS: Law and Justice

/ Plate-forme civique)
/ Alliance de la gauche démocratique)
/ Droit et justice)

POLKOWSKA, Ewa (Ms./Mme)
Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP
KARWOWSKA-SOKOLOWSKA, Agata (Ms./Mme)
Adviser / Conseillère

Secretary General of the Senate
Secrétaire générale du Sénat
Director, Analysis and Documentation Office, Chancellery
of the Senate / Directrice du Bureau de l'analyse et de la
documentation, Chancellerie du Sénat

GRUBA, Wojciech (Mr./M.)
Administrative Secretary of the Group and
to the delegation / Secrétaire administratif
du Groupe et de la délégation

PORTUGAL

SILVA, Guilherme (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Deputy Speaker of the Assembly of the Republic
Vice-Président de l'Assemblée de la République (PSD)

COSTA, Alberto (Mr./M.)

Member of the Assembly of the Republic
Membre de l'Assemblée de la République (PS)

ALBERNAZ, Rosa Maria (Ms./Mme)

Member of the Assembly of the Republic
Membre de l'Assemblée de la République (PS)

CARDOSO, Paula (Ms./Mme)

Member of the Assembly of the Republic
Membre de l'Assemblée de la République (PSD)

PACHECO, Duarte (Mr./M.)

Member of the Assembly of the Republic
Membre de l'Assemblée de la République (PSD)

JESUS, Fernando (Mr./M.)

Member of the Assembly of the Republic
Membre de l'Assemblée de la République (PS)

ALMEIDA, João (Mr./M.)

Member of the Assembly of the Republic
Membre de l'Assemblée de la République (CDS)⁶⁸

TAVARES, João (Mr./M.)

Secretary General / Secrétaire général

BOTELHO LEAL, Isabel (Mrs./Mme)
Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe

Parliamentary Official / Assistante parlementaire

QATAR

AL-MEADADI, Rashid Hamad (Mr./M.)

Member of the Advisory Council
Membre du Conseil consultatif

AL-MAJID, Abdulreda Mahdi (Mr./M.)

Head of the Editing and Translation Section, Secretariat
of the Majlis Al-Shura / Chef de la Section de la publication
et de la traduction du Secrétariat du Majlis Al-Choura

REPUBLIC OF KOREA – REPUBLIQUE DE COREE

KANG, Chang-Hee (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Speaker of the National Assembly
Président de l'Assemblée nationale

NAM, Kyung-Pil (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (SP)

LEE, Jong-Kul (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (DUP)

CHIN, Young (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (SP)

YANG, Seung-Jo (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (DUP)

KIM, Tae-Ho (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (SP)

⁶⁸ (PSD: Social Democratic Party
(PS: Socialist Party
(CDS: Democratic and Social Centre

/ Parti social démocratique)
/ Parti socialiste)
/ Centre démocratique et social)

HAN, Jeoung-Ae (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (DUP) ⁶⁹
CHUNG, Jin-Suk (Mr./M.)	Chief of Staff to the Speaker Chef du Secrétariat du Président
KOO, Hee-Kwon (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Deputy Secretary General of the National Assembly Secrétaire général adjoint de l'Assemblée nationale
KIM, Sung-Yong (Mr./M.)	Senior Secretary to the Speaker, Political Affairs Secrétaire principal du Président, Affaires politiques
BAE, Sung-Rye (Mr./M.)	Spokesman of the National Assembly Porte-parole de l'Assemblée nationale
KIM, Seung-Gi (Mr./M.)	Director General of International Affairs and Protocol Bureau / Directeur général du Bureau des affaires internationales et du protocole
YIM, Geun-Hyeong (Mr./M.)	Principal Secretary to the Speaker, Foreign Affairs Secrétaire principal du Président, Affaires étrangères
JEONG, Hong-Jin (Mr./M.)	Director, Protocol Department Directeur du Département du protocole
KANG, Dae-Hun (Mr./M.)	Director of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference Department Directeur du Département des conférences interparlementaires
CHOI, Seung-Joo (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP, Interpreter Membre de l'ASGP, Interprète	Protocol Officer / Chargée du protocole
HYUN, Seung-Cheol (Mr./M.)	Deputy Director, Protocol Department Directeur adjoint du Département du protocole
CHAE, Mi-Kang (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Deputy Director, Management Support Department Directrice adjointe du Département du support de gestion
IM, So-Young (Ms./Mme) Interpreter / Interprète	Protocol Officer / Chargée du protocole
KIM, You-Jeong (Ms./Mme) Interpreter / Interprète	Protocol Officer / Chargée du protocole
CHO, Seo Yeon (Ms./Mme) Interpreter / Interprète	Protocol Officer / Chargée du protocole
CHOI, Sung-Won (Mr./M.) Security Officer / Agent de sécurité	
PARK, Moon-Sook (Ms./Mme)	Secretary to the Speaker / Secrétaire du Président
CHUNG, Hyun-Sun (Ms./Mme)	Secretary to the Speaker / Secrétaire du Président
CHO, Sung-Hoon (Mr./M.) Coordinator / Coordinateur	Programme Officer / Chargé de programme
LEE, Chul-Kyu (Mr./M.) Coordinator / Coordinateur	Programme Officer / Chargé de programme
WOO, Jee Hyun (Ms./Mme) Coordinator / Coordinatrice	Programme Officer / Chargée de programme
HWANG, Dong-Chun (Mr./M.) Coordinator / Coordinateur	Programme Officer / Chargé de programme
LEE, Ji-Su (Ms./Mme) Adviser / Conseillère	

⁶⁹ (SP: Saenuri Party
(DUP: Democratic United Party

/ Parti Saenuri)
(Parti démocratique unifié)

KIM, Chin-Hyuk (Mr./M.)
Press / Presse

LEE, Oh-Hyung (Mr./M.)
Press / Presse

NO, Byoung-Hun (Mr./M.)
Press / Presse

CHANG, Jung-Yun (Ms./Mme)
Press / Presse

ROMANIA – ROUMANIE

MARCUTIANU, Ovidius (Mr./M.)
Member of the Governing Council, Leader of
the delegation / Membre du Conseil directeur,
Chef de la délégation

Senator, Deputy Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee
Sénateur, Vice-Président de la Commission des affaires
étrangères (NUPR)

AXENIE, Carmen (Ms./Mme)
Member of the Governing Council
Membre du Conseil directeur

Member of the Chamber of Deputies
Membre de la Chambre des Députés (DLP)

MOCANU, Alexandru (Mr./M.)
Member of the Governing Council
Membre du Conseil directeur

Senator / Sénateur (DLP) ⁷⁰

DUMITRESCU, Cristina (Mrs./Mme)
Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe

Head of Division, International Parliamentary Organizations,
Senate / Chef de la Division des organisations parlementaires
internationales du Sénat

GEORGIAN, Daniela Rodica (Mrs./Mme)
Secretary to the delegation
Secrétaire de la délégation

Expert, General Division for Foreign Affairs, Chamber
of Deputies / Experte à la Division générale des affaires
étrangères de la Chambre des Députés

RUSSIAN FEDERATION – FEDERATION DE RUSSIE

BABAKOV, Alexander (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Member of the State Duma / Membre de la Douma d'Etat
(United Russia)

FROLOV, Nikolay (Mr./M.)

Member of the Council of the Federation
Membre du Conseil de la Fédération

GAVRILOV, Sergey (Mr./M.)

Member of the State Duma, Chairman of the Committee
on Property / Membre de la Douma d'Etat, Président de
la Commission de la propriété (KPRF)

PETRENKO, Valentina (Mrs./Mme)

Member of the Council of the Federation, Chairperson
of the Committee on Social Policy and Public Health
Membre du Conseil de la Fédération, Présidente de la
Commission de la politique sociale et de la santé publique

TIMOFEEVA, Olga (Ms./Mme)

Member of the State Duma / Membre de la Douma d'Etat
(United Russia)

STARSHINOV, Mikhail (Mr./M.)

Member of the State Duma, Deputy Chairman of the
Committee on Nationalities Affairs / Membre de la Douma
d'Etat, Président de la Commission des affaires relatives
aux nationalités (United Russia) ⁷¹

STAVITSKY, Valery (Mr./M.)
Secretary to the delegation
Secrétaire de la délégation

Senior Consultant, International Department, State Duma
Consultant principal, Département international de la
Douma d'Etat

⁷⁰ (NUPR: National Union for the Progress of Romania
(DLP: Democratic-Liberal Party

/ Union nationale pour le progrès de la Roumanie)
(Parti libéral national)

⁷¹ (United Russia
(KPRF: Communist Party

/ Russie unifiée)
(Parti communiste)

BURGUTO, Denis (Mr./M.)
Member of the ASGP, Secretary to the delegation
Membre de l'ASGP, Secrétaire de la délégation
ERMOSHIN Pavel (Mr./M.)

Adviser, International Department, Council of the Federation
Conseiller au Département international du Conseil de la
Fédération

Senior Advisor, Secretariat of the Inter-Parliamentary
Organizations Unit of the Council of the Federation
Conseiller principal au Secrétariat de l'Unité des
organisations interparlementaires du Conseil de
la Fédération

SHCHERBAKOV, Stanislav (Mr./M.)

Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs / Conseiller au Ministère
des affaires étrangères

KOCHETKOV, Maxim (Mr./M.)
Interpreter / Interprète

BELOVA, Yulia (Ms./Mme)
Interpreter / Interprète

OSOKIN, Boris (Mr./M.)
Interpreter / Interprète

BOGDANOVA, Natalia (Ms./Mme)
Interpreter / Interprète

LEVDANSKAYA, Ella (Ms./Mme)
Interpreter / Interprète

RWANDA

MUKAKALISA, Faith (Ms./Mme)

Senator / Sénatrice

SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE – SAO TOME-ET-PRINCIPE

DE ESPÍRITO SANTO CARVALHO, Evaristo (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Speaker of the National Assembly
Président de l'Assemblée nationale (ADI)

SANTIAGO DAS NEVES, Delfin (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PCD)

DA GRAÇA DOMINGOS, Isabel Mayza (Ms./Mme)

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (ADI)

DOS RAMOS, Guilherme Octaviano (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (MLSTP/PSD) ⁷²

PIRES dos SANTOS, Yuri (Mr./M.)

Director, Office of the Speaker
Directeur du Bureau du Président

DA CONCEIÇÃO MANUEL, Filipe (Mr./M.)
Security to the Speaker / Agent de sécurité du Président

SAUDI ARABIA – ARABIE SAOUDITE

ALHUSSEINI, Saleh (Mr./M.)

Member of the Shura Council
Membre du Conseil de la Choura

ALNAMLAH, Saleh (Mr./M.)

Member of the Shura Council
Membre du Conseil de la Choura

ALAMER, Mohammed (Mr./M.)
Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP

Secretary General / Secrétaire général

ALMANSOUR, Khalid Mohammed (Mr./M.)

General Manager of the Inter-Parliamentary Relations
Department / Directeur général du Département des
relations interparlementaires

⁷² (ADI: Independent Democratic Action
(PCD: Democratic Convergence Party
(MLSTP: Sao Tome and Principe Liberation Movement
(PSD: Social Democratic Party

/ Alliance démocratique indépendante)
(Parti démocratique de convergence)
(Mouvement de libération de Sao Tomé-et-Principe)
(Parti social démocratique)

ALNASSER, Nasser (Mr./M.)	Secretary General's Office Manager Directeur du Bureau du Secrétaire général
ALSAEED, Mohammed Nasser (Mr./M.)	Parliamentary Relations Officer Chargé des relations parlementaires
ALHUDAITHY, Bader (Mr./M.) Interpreter / Interprète	
AL MARSHAD, Fahad (Mr./M.)	Protocol Officer / Chargé du protocole
ALMUBARAK, Khalid (Mr./M.)	Secretary, Secretary General's Office Secrétaire au Bureau du Secrétaire général

SERBIA – SERBIE

STEFANOVIĆ, Nebojša (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale (SNS)
KOLUNDŽIJA, Nada (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (DS)
OBRADOVIĆ, Marija (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (SNS) ⁷³
LJUBIČIĆ, Jana (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General / Secrétaire générale
UROŠEVIĆ, Jasminka (Ms./Mme)	Head of Protocol / Chef du protocole
POPOVIĆ, Miodrag (Mr./M.)	Advisor to the Speaker / Conseiller du Président
FILIPOVIĆ, Vladimir (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Advisor, Department for Foreign Affairs Conseiller au Département des affaires étrangères
STAMENOVIĆ, Saša (Mr./M.) Security Officer / Agent de sécurité	
ANTIĆ, Strahinja (Mr./M.) Security Officer / Agent de sécurité	

SEYCHELLES

HERMINIE, Patrick (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the People's National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale populaire (SPPF) ⁷⁴
AZAREL, Ernesta (Ms./Mme)	Clerk of the National Assembly Secrétaire générale de l'Assemblée nationale

SINGAPORE – SINGAPOUR

FONG, Arthur (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (PAP)
CHIA, Shi-Lu (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (PAP)
SINGH, Pritam (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (WP) ⁷⁵
QUEK, Wee Ling (Ms./Mme) Secretary / Secrétaire	

⁷³ (SNS: Serbian Progressive Party

/ Parti progressiste serbe)

(DS: Democratic Party

/ Parti démocratique)

⁷⁴ (SPPF: Seychelles People's Progressive Front

/ Front progressiste du peuple seychellois)

⁷⁵ (PAP: People's Action Party

/ Parti d'action populaire)

(WP: Workers' Party

/ Parti des travailleurs)

SOUTH AFRICA – AFRIQUE DU SUD

SISULU, Max Vuyisile (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale
KUBAYI, Mmamoloko Tryphosa (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (ANC)
SCHNEEMAN, Gregory (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (ANC)
RAMATLAKANE, Leonard (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (COPE)
NTWANAMBI, Nosipho (Ms./Mme)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (ANC)
TAU, Johannes Raseriti (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
LEE, Trevor Donald (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
TSHABALALA, Judith (Ms./Mme)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
HAJAIG, Fatima (Ms./Mme) Adviser / Conseillère	Member of Parliament, Chairperson of the International Relations Committee / Membre du Parlement, Présidente de la Commission des relations internationales (ANC) ⁷⁶
VAN DER MERWE, Jacobus Hercules (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
MANSURA, Mohamed Kamal (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the National Assembly Secrétaire général de l'Assemblée nationale
LEBEKO, Peter (Mr./M.)	Official / Fonctionnaire
SOMGQEZA, Kaya (Mr./M.)	Division Manager, International Relations and Protocol Directeur de la Division des relations internationales et du protocole
PAULSE, Cheryl Ann (Ms./Mme) Secretary of the Group and to the delegation Secrétaire du Groupe et de la délégation	International Relations Officer Chargée des relations internationales
JARDINE, Zurina (Mrs./Mme) Administrative Secretary of the Group Secrétaire administrative du Groupe	International Relations Assistant Assistante aux relations internationales
MOLLOY-TITUS, Rosalynn (Ms./Mme)	Personal Assistant / Assistante particulière
SAIT-WILLIAMS, Lynette (Ms./Mme)	Researcher / Chercheuse

SOUTH SUDAN – SOUDAN DU SUD

WANI IGGA, James (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Legislative Assembly Président de l'Assemblée législative nationale
GWORIT LADO, Morris (Mr./M.)	Political Advisor / Conseiller politique
TOMBE, Wani John (Mr./M.) Aide de camp	

⁷⁶ (ANC: African National Congress
(COPE: Congress of the People

/ Congrès national africain)
/ Congrès du Peuple)

SPAIN – ESPAGNE

GIL LAZARO, Ignacio (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Member of the Congress of Deputies Membre du Congrès des Députés (PP)
MOSCOSO, Juan (Mr./M.)	Member of the Congress of Deputies Membre du Congrès des Députés (PSOE)
GARCÍA-TIZON, Arturo (Mr./M.)	Member of the Congress of Deputies Membre du Congrès des Députés (PP)
BURGOS BETETA, Tomas (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur (PP)
CHIQUILLO, José (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur
MONTEREÍN RODRIGUEZ, María Virtudes (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Congress of Deputies Membre du Congrès des Députés (PSOE)
TORME PARDO, Ana (Ms./Mme)	Senator / Sénatrice
PIGEM, Mercé (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the Congress of Deputies Membre du Congrès des Députés (CiU) ⁷⁷
DORADO, Fernando (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the Congress of Deputies Secrétaire général du Congrès des Députés
BOYRA, Helena (Mrs./Mme) Adviser / Conseillère	
JUAREZ, M. Rosa (Ms./Mme) Administrative Secretary of the Group Secrétaire administrative du Groupe	

SRI LANKA

DE SILVA, Nimal Siripala (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Member of Parliament, Minister of Irrigation and Water Resources Management / Membre du Parlement, Ministre de la gestion de l'irrigation et des ressources hydriques (UPFA)
SAMARASINGHE, Mahinda (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament, Minister of Plantation Industries Membre du Parlement, Ministre du Secteur des plantations (UPFA) ⁷⁸
FERNANDOPULLE, Sudarshini (Ms./Mme)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
PERERA, Nirosha (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
SIVASAKHTY, Ananthan Nadesu (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
IDDAWALA, Neil (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Deputy Secretary General / Secrétaire général adjoint
PREMASINI, Lionel Peduru Hewage (Mr./M.) Deputy High Commissioner Haut Commissaire adjoint	

SURINAME

PANKA, Ricardo W. (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (NDP)
GAJADIEN, Asiskumar (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale

⁷⁷ (PP: People's Party
(PSOE: Spanish Socialist Workers' Party
(CiU: Convergence and Union

⁷⁸ (UPFA: United People's Freedom Alliance

/ Parti populaire)
/ Parti socialiste ouvrier espagnol)
/ Convergence et union)
/ Alliance de la liberté populaire unifiée)

BEE, Marinus (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the Ministry for Social Affairs and Housing, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the Ministry for Sport and Youth Affairs / Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Président de la Commission permanente du Ministère des affaires sociales et du logement, Président de la Commission permanente du Ministère des sports et de la jeunesse (BEP) ⁷⁹
OEDIT, Marlon Dino Valentino (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Head of the Legal Department Chef du Département juridique
SHARMAN, Fayaz Ahmad (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Deputy Head of the Legal Department Chef adjoint du Département juridique

SWEDEN – SUEDE

AVSAN, Anti (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Member of the Riksdag / Membre du Riksdag (m)
ÖRNFJÄDER, Krister (Mr./M.) Member of the Executive Committee Membre du Comité exécutif	Member of the Riksdag / Membre du Riksdag (s)
KARLSSON, Ulrika (Ms./Mme) Substitute Member of the Committee to promote respect for International Humanitarian Law Membre suppléant du Comité chargé de promouvoir le respect du droit international humanitaire	Member of the Riksdag / Membre du Riksdag (m)
NILSSON, Ulf (Mr./M.)	Member of the Riksdag / Membre du Riksdag (fp)
GREEN, Monica (Ms./Mme) Member of the Committee on Middle East Questions Membre du Comité sur les questions relatives au Moyen-Orient	Member of the Riksdag / Membre du Riksdag (s) ⁸⁰
FLOSSING, Kathrin (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General / Secrétaire générale
EKLÖF, Lena (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Secretary, International Department Secrétaire au Département international
LUNDSTEDT, Helena (Ms./Mme) Deputy Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire adjointe de la délégation	Deputy Secretary, International Department Secrétaire adjointe au Département international
RYDELL, Charlotte (Ms./Mme)	Head of Corporate Planning / Chef de la planification
TUNVED, Ann-Charlott (Ms./Mme)	Secretary to the Committee on Finance Secrétaire de la Commission des finances
LARSSON, Moa (Ms./Mme)	Intern, International Department Stagiaire, Département international

⁷⁹ (NDP: National Democratic Party
(BEP: Brotherhood and Unity in Politics)

⁸⁰ (m: Moderate Party
(s: Social Democratic Party
(fp: Liberal Party

/ Parti démocratique national)
/ Fraternité et unité en politique)
/ Parti modéré)
/ Parti social-démocrate)
/ Parti libéral)

SWITZERLAND – SUISSE

BIERI, Peter (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Member of the Governing Council, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Membre du Conseil directeur, Chef de la délégation	Member of the Council of States Membre du Conseil des Etats (CVP/PDC)
VEILLON, Pierre-François (Mr./M.) Member of the Executive Committee Membre du Comité exécutif	Member of the National Council Membre du Conseil national (SVP/UDC)
JANIAK, Claude (Mr./M.)	Member of the Council of States Membre du Conseil des Etats (SP/PS)
KIENER NELLEN, Margret (Mrs./Mme) Substitute Member of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians Membre suppléant du Comité des droits de l'homme des parlementaires	Member of the National Council Membre du Conseil national (SP/PS)
MEIER-SCHATZ, Lucrezia (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Council Membre du Conseil national (CVP/PDC) ⁸¹
LANZ, Christoph (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General of the Federal Assembly Secrétaire général de l'Assemblée fédérale
SCHWAB, Philippe (Mr./M.) Member of the Executive Committee of the ASGP / Membre du Comité exécutif de l'ASGP	Deputy Secretary General of the Federal Assembly Secrétaire général adjoint de l'Assemblée fédérale
ZEHNDER, Daniel (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Deputy Head, International Relations Division Chef adjoint de la Division des relations internationales
PIOTET, Laure (Mrs./Mme) Substitute Secretary of the Group Secrétaire suppléante du Groupe	

THAILAND – THAÏLANDE

WAIRATPANIJ, Nikom (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	President of the Senate / Président du Sénat
BOONTONG, Tassana (Ms./Mme) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Senator / Sénatrice
TANBANJONG, Phairoj (Mr./M.) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (PT)
SITTHEEAMORN, Kiat (Mr./M.) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (DP)
KRAIRIKSH, Pikulkeaw (Mrs./Mme)	Senator, Chairperson of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate / Sénatrice, Présidente de la Commission des affaires étrangères du Sénat
PONLABOOT, Alongkorn (Mr./M.) Member of the Committee on Middle East Questions / Membre du Comité sur les questions relatives au Moyen-Orient	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (DP)

⁸¹ (CVP/PDC: Christian Democrat People's Party
(SVP/UDC: Swiss People's Party
(SP/PS: Social Democratic Party

/ Parti démocrate-chrétien)
/ Union démocratique du centre)
/ Parti socialiste)

PHALUSUK, Phiraphan (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (PT)
SUJAREE, Niramit (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (PT)
KLAMPAIBOON, Ong-art (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Member of the House of Representatives Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (DP) ⁸²
PANOMKWAN, Kwanchai (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	Senator / Sénateur
VANIGHBANDHU, Sompol (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Deputy Secretary General of the House of Representatives Secrétaire général adjoint de la Chambre des Représentants
PANPRUANG, Charae (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Deputy Secretary General of the Senate Secrétaire général adjoint du Sénat
MANUNPICHU, Somsak (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Deputy Secretary General of the Senate Secrétaire général adjoint du Sénat
PUTORNJAI, La-Or (Mrs./Mme)	Director of the Bureau for Foreign Affairs of the Senate Directrice du Bureau des affaires étrangères du Sénat
MASRICHAN, Krisanee (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Director of the Inter-Parliamentary Union Division, Bureau of Inter-Parliamentary Organizations, Secretariat of the House of Representatives / Directrice de la Division de l'Union interparlementaire, Bureau des organisations interparlementaires du Secrétariat de la Chambre des Représentants
MINGMITR, Pakpoom (Mr./M.) Assistant Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire adjoint de la délégation	Senior Foreign Affairs Officer in charge of the Inter- Parliamentary Union Division, Bureau of Inter- Parliamentary Organizations, Secretariat of the House of Representatives / Chargé principal des affaires étrangères, Division de l'Union interparlementaire, Bureau des organisations interparlementaires du Secrétariat de la Chambre des Représentants
WIBOONCHAN, Nisaporn (Ms./Mme) Assistant Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire adjointe de la délégation	Foreign Affairs Officer, Inter-Parliamentary Union Division, Bureau of Inter-Parliamentary Organizations, Secretariat of the Senate / Chargée des affaires étrangères, Division de l'Union interparlementaire, Bureau des organisations interparlementaires du Secrétariat du Sénat
WIBOONPANUVEJ, Tana (Ms./Mme) Assistant Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire adjointe de la délégation	Foreign Relations Officer, Inter-Parliamentary Union Division, Bureau of Inter-Parliamentary Organizations, Secretariat of the House of Representatives / Chargée des relations étrangères, Division de l'Union interparlementaire, Bureau des organisations interparlementaires du Secrétariat de la Chambre des Représentants
TOSOMPARK, Ronnachai (Mr./M.) Assistant Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire adjoint de la délégation	Foreign Affairs Officer, Inter-Parliamentary Union Division, Bureau of Inter-Parliamentary Organizations, Secretariat of the House of Representatives / Chargé des affaires étrangères, Division de l'Union interparlementaire, Bureau des organisations interparlementaires du Secrétariat de la Chambre des Représentants
NOPPAWONG, Monton (Mr./M.) Secretary / Secrétaire	Director of the Association of Parliaments and Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments Division, Secretariat of the House of Representatives, Bureau of Inter-Parliamentary Organizations / Directeur de la Division de l'Association des parlements et de l'Association des Secrétaires généraux de parlements, Secrétariat de la Chambre des Représentants, Bureau des organisations interparlementaires

⁸² (PT: Pheu Thai Party
(DP: Democratic Party

/ Parti Pheu Thai)
/ Parti démocratique)

LEELANOND, Kanteera (Ms./Mme)
Assistant Secretary / Secrétaire adjointe

Foreign Affairs Officer, Inter-Parliamentary Union Division,
Bureau of Inter-Parliamentary Organizations, Secretariat
of the House of Representatives / Chargée des affaires
étrangères, Division de l'Union interparlementaire, Bureau
des organisations interparlementaires du Secrétariat de
la Chambre des Représentants

WEERANUCH, Tianchaikul (Ms./Mme)
Assistant Secretary / Secrétaire adjointe

Secretary / Secrétaire

PIYACHAT, Chunchit (Mr./M.)
Assistant Secretary / Secrétaire adjoint

Secretary / Secrétaire

NINNAD, Udomphol (Mr./M.)
Ambassador of Thailand to Canada
Ambassadeur de la Thaïlande au Canada

TIMOR-LESTE

GUTERRES, Aniceto (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Parliament
Membre du Parlement national

DIAS XIMENES, David (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Parliament
Membre du Parlement national

DA COSTA GUTERRES, Manuel Guilherme (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Parliament
Membre du Parlement national

CORREIA, Brigida Antonia (Ms./Mme)

Member of the National Parliament
Membre du Parlement national

LENCASTRE, Bruno (Mr./M.)
Secretary to the delegation
Secrétaire de la délégation

Legal Advisor / Conseiller juridique

DOS REIS, Vitorino (Mr./M.)

Support Staff / Secrétariat

TOGO

BAMNANTE, Komikpim (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Member of the National Assembly, Chairman of
the Committee on Constitutional Law and General
Administration Legislation / Membre de l'Assemblée
nationale, Président de la Commission des lois
constitutionnelles et de la législation de l'administration
générale (Unir)

DJOBO OURO BANG'NA, Nassara (Mrs./Mme)

Second Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly
Deuxième Vice-Présidente de l'Assemblée nationale (Unir)

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO – TRINITE-ET-TOBAGO

KHAN, Nela (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants

DEONARINE, Ralph (Mr./M.)

Secretary General / Secrétaire général

FRITZ, Annika (Ms./Mme)
Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP

Senior Legal Officer, Parliament
Chargée des affaires légales au Parlement

JACOBS, Lydia (Ms./Mme)
Adviser / Conseillère

TUNISIA – TUNISIE

ABID, Larbi (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Second Deputy Speaker of the National Constituent Assembly / Deuxième Vice-Président de l'Assemblée nationale constituante
MRABTI, Nouredine (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Constituent Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale constituante
ASKRI, Nabila (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Constituent Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale constituante
AOUATTI, Najoua (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Adviser, External Relations Unit Conseillère à l'Unité des relations extérieures

TURKEY – TURQUIE

DAĞCI CİĞLİK, Fazilet (Ms./Mme) President of the Group, First Vice-President of the Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians, Leader of the delegation Présidente du Groupe, Première Vice-Présidente du Comité de coordination des femmes parlementaires, Chef de la délégation	Member of the Grand National Assembly Membre de la Grande Assemblée nationale (AKP)
SERTER, Fatma Nur (Mrs./Mme)	Member of the Grand National Assembly Membre de la Grande Assemblée nationale (CHP)
GÜNEŞ, Hurşit (Mr./M.)	Member of the Grand National Assembly Membre de la Grande Assemblée nationale (CHP)
KORKMAZ, Süleyman (Mr./M.)	Member of the Grand National Assembly Membre de la Grande Assemblée nationale (MHP) ⁸³
YILDIRIM, Murat (Mr./M.)	Member of the Grand National Assembly Membre de la Grande Assemblée nationale
ERSOY, Mehmet (Mr./M.)	Member of the Grand National Assembly Membre de la Grande Assemblée nationale
BAYAZIT KACAR, Sevde (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Grand National Assembly Membre de la Grande Assemblée nationale
NEZIROĞLU, İrfan (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Secretary General / Secrétaire général
EROĞLU, İzzet (Mr./M.)	Deputy Head of the Foreign Relations and Protocol Department / Chef adjoint du Département des relations étrangères et du protocole
USLU, Yesim (Ms./Mme)	Secretary to the Secretary General Secrétaire du Secrétaire général
SERDENGECTI, Süleyman (Mr./M.) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	
AKDEMİR, Buket (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	

⁸³ (AKP: Justice and Development Party
(CHP: Republican People's Party
(MHP: Nationalist Movement Party

/ Parti de la justice et du développement)
/ Parti populaire républicain)
/ Parti d'action nationaliste)

UGANDA – OUGANDA

KADAGA, Rebecca (Ms./Mme) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of Parliament / Présidente du Parlement (NRM)
DOMBO, Emmanuel (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (NRM)
TURYAHIKAYO, Paula (Ms./Mme)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (NRM)
AMONGI, Betty (Ms./Mme)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
OKUMU, Ronald Reagan (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement (FDC) ⁸⁴
BALYEJJUSA, Sulaiman (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
KIBIRIGE, Jane (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Clerk to Parliament / Secrétaire générale
WABWIRE, Paul (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Deputy Clerk, Legislative Services Greffier adjoint, Services législatifs
NYAMWENGE, Alice (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation / Secrétaire de la délégation	
ODEKE, Peter (Mr./M.)	Protocol Officer / Chargé du protocole
KASULE, Ali Kabuye (Mr./M.)	Protocol Officer / Chargé du protocole

UKRAINE

DOVHYI, Stanislav (Mr./M.)	Member of the Verkhovna Rada Membre du Verkhovna Rada (PP)
GRYTSAK, Vasyl (Mr./M.)	Member of the Verkhovna Rada, Head of the Sub-Committee on Legislative Support of Law Enforcement / Membre du Verkhovna Rada, Chef de la Sous-Commission du soutien législatif du renforcement de la loi (PR)
LUKIANOVA, Kateryna (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Verkhovna Rada, Chairperson of the Sub-Committee on Family, Youth, Sports and Tourism Membre du Verkhovna Rada, Présidente de la Sous-Commission de la famille, des jeunes, des sports et du tourisme (PSD) ⁸⁵
YOLOVYI, Volodymyr (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP, Secretary of the Group Membre de l'ASGP, Secrétaire du Groupe	Secretary General of the Verkhovna Rada Secrétaire général du Verkhovna Rada
PACHESIUK, Yulia (Ms./Mme) Acting Secretary / Secrétaire par intérim	Chief Consultant / Consultante principale

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES – EMIRATS ARABES UNIS

AL QUBAISI, Amal Abdulla (Ms./Mme) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	First Deputy Chairperson of the Federal National Council Première Vice-Présidente du Conseil national de la Fédération
AL SHURAIQI, Rashed Mohammed (Mr./M.)	Member of the Federal National Council Membre du Conseil national de la Fédération
AL MANSOORI, Ahmed Obaid (Mr./M.)	Member of the Federal National Council Membre du Conseil national de la Fédération
AL BAHAR, Muna (Ms./Mme)	Member of the Federal National Council Membre du Conseil national de la Fédération
AL SHAMSI, Abdulrahman Ali (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Assistant Secretary General of the Federal National Council Secrétaire général adjoint du Conseil national de la Fédération

⁸⁴ (NRM: National Resistance Movement
(FDC: Forum for Democratic Change

⁸⁵ (PP: People's Party
(PR: Party of Regions

(PSD: Bloc « Our Ukraine - People's Self-Defense »

/ Mouvement de la Résistance nationale)
/ Forum pour un changement démocratique)
/ Parti populaire)
/ Parti des régions)
/ Bloc Notre Ukraine - Autodéfense populaire)

AL MUHAIRI, Juma (Mr./M.)	Head of Protocole / Chef du protocole
AL BLOUSHI, Hamda (Mr./M.)	Head of Research and Parliamentary Studies Chef de la recherche et des études parlementaires
AL SHEHHI, Abdulrahman (Mr./M.)	Parliamentary Researcher / Chercheur parlementaire
AL AQILI, Ahmed (Mr./M.)	Parliamentary Researcher / Chercheur parlementaire
AL ZAROUNI, Eisa (Ms./Mme)	Executive Media / Chargée des médias
AL MUHAIRI, Saeed (Mr./M.)	Protocol Officer / Chargé du protocole

UNITED KINGDOM – ROYAUME-UNI

WALTER, Robert (Mr./M.) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Président du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Member of the House of Commons Membre de la Chambre des Communes (C)
EVANS, Nigel (Mr./M.)	Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons Vice-Président de la Chambre des Communes (C)
JUDD, Frank (Lord)	Member of the House of Lords Membre de la Chambre des Lords (L)
FAULKNER of WORCESTER, Richard (Lord)	Member of the House of Lords Membre de la Chambre des Lords (L)
LIDDELL-GRAINGER, Ian (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Commons Membre de la Chambre des Communes (C)
DAVIES of STAMFORD, Quentin (Lord)	Member of the House of Lords Membre de la Chambre des Lords (L)
Rt. Hon. DHOLAKIA OBE DL, Navnit (Lord)	Member of the House of Lords Membre de la Chambre des Lords (Lib Dems) ⁸⁶
NIMMO, Rick (Mr./M.)	Director / Directeur
REES, Dominique (Ms./Mme) Deputy Secretary / Secrétaire adjointe	
LIBEROTTI, Gabriella (Ms./Mme) Assistant Secretary / Secrétaire administrative	
PICHÉ, Nicole (Ms./Mme) Human Rights Advisor Conseillère aux droits de l'homme	
PULLINGER, John (Mr./M.) Adviser / Conseiller	
NATZLER, David (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Clerk Assistant, House of Commons Greffier assistant, Chambre des Communes
WALTERS, Rhodri (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Reading Clerk and Clerk of the Overseas Office, House of Lords / Secrétaire général adjoint et Secrétaire du Service des affaires étrangères, Chambre des Lords
MARK, Steven (Mr./M.) Joint Secretary of the ASGP / Co-Secrétaire de l'ASGP	
STURT, Jenny (Ms./Mme) ASGP Secretariat / Secrétariat de l'ASGP	
HOLDICH, Patrick (Mr./M.) British Consul General / Consul britannique	
ROBERTSON, Corin (Ms./Mme) British Deputy High Commissioner Haut Commissaire britannique adjoint	

⁸⁶ (C: Conservative Party
(L: Labour Party
(Lib Dems: Liberal Democrats

/ Parti conservateur)
/ Parti travailliste)
/ Démocrates libéraux)

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA – REPUBLIQUE-UNIE DE TANZANIE

MAKINDA, Anne (Ms./Mme) President of the Group, Leader of the delegation Présidente du Groupe, Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Présidente de l'Assemblée nationale (CCM)
LYIMO, Susan (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly, Spokesperson of the Committee on Education and Vocational Training Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Porte-parole de la Commission de l'éducation et de la formation professionnelle (CHADEMA)
MOHAMED, Rashid (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
KAFULILA, David (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (NCCR-Mageuzi) ⁸⁷
NYAMBELE, Kileo (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Director, Library and Research Directeur de la bibliothèque et de la recherche
ELIUFOO, Daniel (Mr./M.)	Director/Adviser, Speaker's Office Directeur/Conseiller au Bureau de la Présidente
WARBURG, James (Mr./M.) Secretary of the Group / Secrétaire du Groupe	Assistant Director, Table Office Directeur adjoint du Service de l'ordre du jour
BEREGE, Herman (Mr./M.)	Personal Assistant to the Speaker Assistant particulier de la Présidente
MWANDUMBYA, Owen (Mr./M.)	Information Officer / Chargé de l'information
MWAKASEGE, Alphonse Martin (Mr./M.) Aide de camp to the Speaker Aide de camp de la Présidente	
HOKORORO, Suzan Peter (Ms./Mme) Assistant Aide de camp to the Speaker Aide de camp adjointe de la Présidente	

URUGUAY

XAVIER, Monica (Mrs./Mme) Member of the Advisory Group on HIV/AIDS, Member of the Governing Council (21-22/10), Leader of the delegation (21-22/10) / Membre du Groupe consultatif sur le VIH/sida, Membre du Conseil directeur (21-22/10), Chef de la délégation (21-22/10)	Senator / Sénatrice (FA)
TAJAM, Héctor (Mr./M.) Member of the Executive Committee (23-26/10), Member of the Governing Council (23-26/10), Leader of the delegation (23-26/10) / Membre du Comité exécutif (23-26/10), Membre du Conseil directeur (23-26/10), Chef de la délégation (23-26/10)	Senator / Sénateur (FA)
LARRAÑAGA, Jorge (Mr./M.) Member of the Governing Council Membre du Conseil directeur	Senator / Sénateur (PN)
PENADÉS, Gustavo (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur (PN)

⁸⁷ (CCM: Revolutionary Party of Tanzania / Parti révolutionnaire de Tanzanie)
(CHADEMA: Party of Democracy and Development / Parti de la démocratie et du développement)
(NCCR-Mageuzi: National Convention for Construction and Reform - Mageuzi / Convention nationale pour la construction et la réforme - Mageuzi)

PASSADA, Ivonne (Mrs./Mme)
Member of the Executive Committee (21-22/10),
Member of the Governing Council (21-22/10)
Membre du Comité exécutif (21-22/10),
Membre du Conseil directeur (21-22/10)

RODRIGUEZ FILIPPINI, Hugo (Mr./M.)
Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP

PIQUINELA, Oscar (Mr./M.)
Secretary of the Group and of the GRULAC
Secrétaire du Groupe et du GRULAC

GALVALISI, Carina (Mrs./Mme)
Adviser to the Group, GRULAC Secretariat
Conseillère du Groupe, Secrétariat du GRULAC

ROSSELLI, Elbio (Mr./M.)
Ambassador of Uruguay to Canada
Ambassadeur de l'Uruguay au Canada

Member of the House of Representatives
Membre de la Chambre des Représentants (FA) ⁸⁸

Secretary General of the Senate
Secrétaire général du Sénat

Head of the International Relations Department
Directeur du Département des relations internationales

International Relations Department
Département des relations internationales

VENEZUELA

VIVAS, Ramón Darío (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Member of the National Assembly, Chairman of the
Standing Committee on Popular Power and Media
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Président de la
Commission permanente du pouvoir populaire et
des médias (PSUV)

MATA, Victoria (Ms./Mme)

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PSUV)

REQUENA, Gladys (Mrs./Mme)

Member of the National Assembly, Deputy Chairperson
of the Committee on Culture and Leisure Activities
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale, Vice-Présidente
de la Commission de la culture et des loisirs (PSUV)

MARQUINA, Alfonso (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (NT) ⁸⁹

GAVIDIA, Walter (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale

MUNDARAIN, Sebastian (Mr./M.)
Adviser / Conseiller

LOPEZ, Gabriel (Mr./M.)
Press / Presse

GOMEZ, Rubén (Mr./M.)
Press / Presse

MORONTA, Ronald (Mr./M.)
Press / Presse

MORON, Deivid (Mr./M.)
Press / Presse

VIET NAM

TRAN VAN HANG (Mr./M.)
Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation

Member of the National Assembly, Chairman of the
Foreign Affairs Committee / Membre de l'Assemblée
nationale, Président de la Commission des affaires
étrangères (CPV)

VAN PHAM TAN (Mr./M.)

Member of the National Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (CPV)

⁸⁸ (FA: Frente Amplio (Broad Front)

(PN: National Party

⁸⁹ (PSUV: United Socialist Party of Venezuela

(NT: A New Era

/ Front élargi)

/ Parti national)

/ Parti socialiste uni du Venezuela)

/ Un nouveau temps)

PHAM THI HAI (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (CPV)
VU HAI HA (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (CPV) ⁹⁰
DAO DU Y TRUNG (Mr./M.)	Head, Inter-Parliamentary Division, Foreign Affairs Department / Chef de la Division interparlementaire du Département des affaires étrangères
NGUYEN TUONG VAN (Mrs./Mme)	Deputy Director, Foreign Affairs Department Directrice adjointe du Département des affaires étrangères

YEMEN

AL-RA'AE, Yahya (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of Parliament / Président du Parlement
SOFAN Ahmed (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
SHAMI, Ziad (Mr./M.)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
NAGI, Oras (Ms./Mme)	Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
AL-RA'AE, Ma'an (Mr./M.)	Director, Speaker's Office Directeur du Bureau du Président
ABDULLAH, Kaid (Mr./M.)	Director / Directeur
FAKHRI, Esam (Mr./M.)	Head of Protocol / Chef du protocole
AL-ASBAHI, Khldoon (Mr./M.) Press / Presse	
AL-ROSABI, Ali (Mr./M.) Security Officer / Agent de sécurité	

ZAMBIA – ZAMBIE

MATIBINI, Patrick (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale
MWIIMBU, Jacob (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (UPND)
CHITOTELA, Ronald (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale (PF) ⁹¹
KALIMA, Victoria (Ms./Mme)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
MONDE, Greyford (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
MUTELO, Misheck (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
MWINGA, Katai Doris (Ms./Mme) Member of the ASGP, Secretary of the Group Membre de l'ASGP, Secrétaire du Groupe	Clerk of the National Assembly Secrétaire générale de l'Assemblée nationale
NGULUBE, Roy (Mr./M.)	Executive Assistant to the Speaker Assistant exécutif du Président
MANDA, Iréné (Ms./Mme) Secretary to the delegation Secrétaire de la délégation	Assistant Principal Clerk for Public and International Relations / Chargée principale adjointe des relations publiques et internationales
MONGA, Pauline (Ms./Mme)	Protocol Officer / Chargée du protocole

⁹⁰ (CPV: Communist Party

/ Parti communiste)

⁹¹ (UPND: United Party for National Development

/ Parti uni pour le développement national)

(PF: Patriotic Front

/ Front patriotique)

ZIMBABWE

MADZONGWE, Edna (Mrs./Mme) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	President of the Senate / Présidente du Sénat (ZANU/PF)
MOYO, Lovemore (Mr./M.) Leader of the delegation / Chef de la délégation	Speaker of the National Assembly Président de l'Assemblée nationale (MDC)
MUCHENJE, Virginia (Mrs./Mme)	Senator / Sénatrice (ZANU-PF)
MADZIMURE, Willias (Mr./M.)	Member of the House of Assembly Membre de la Chambre des Assemblées (MDC)
GAULE, Believe (Mr./M.)	Senator / Sénateur (MDC) ⁹²
CHIBAYA, Amos (Mr./M.)	Member of the National Assembly Membre de l'Assemblée nationale
ZVOMA, Austin (Mr./M.) Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP	Clerk of Parliament / Secrétaire général
CHIPARE, Godfrey (Mr./M.)	Principal Director, External Relations Directeur principal des relations extérieures
ZITHA, Xolani (Mr./M.)	Manager, Speaker's Office Directeur du Bureau du Président
MARIMO, Ndamuka (Mr./M.)	Director, Clerk's Office Directeur du Bureau du Secrétaire général
CHINYEMBA, Gift (Mr./M.)	Security Aide to the Speaker of the National Assembly Agent de sécurité du Président de l'Assemblée nationale
SIBANDA, Robert (Mr./M.)	Security Aide to the President of the Senate Agent de sécurité de la Présidente du Sénat

II. ASSOCIATE MEMBERS – MEMBRES ASSOCIES**EAST AFRICAN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (EALA)
ASSEMBLEE LEGISLATIVE EST-AFRICAINE (ALEA)**

ZZIWA, Nantong Margaret (Ms./Mme), Speaker, Leader of the delegation / Présidente, Chef de la délégation
 OPOKA, Okumu Chris (Mr./M.), Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
 KESSY, Nderakindo Perpetua (Ms./Mme), Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
 NYIRAHBINEZA, Valerie (Ms./Mme), Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
 MADETE, Kenneth (Mr./M.), Member of the ASGP, Clerk / Membre de l'ASGP, Secrétaire général
 NDAYIZEYE, Beatrice (Ms./Mme), Senior Clerk Assistant / Greffière assistante principale
 KALIBA, Winifred (Mrs./Mme), Protocol Officer / Chargée du protocole

**INTER-PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE OF THE WEST AFRICAN ECONOMIC AND MONETARY UNION
(WAEMU)
COMITE INTERPARLEMENTAIRE DE L'UNION ECONOMIQUE ET MONETAIRE OUEST-AFRICAINE
(UEMOA)**

DRAMANI, Dama (Mr./M.), President / Président
 BAKALI, Yobate Kolani (Ms./Mme), Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement
 IDI GADO, Boubacar (Mr./M.), Member of the ASGP, Secretary General / Membre de l'ASGP, Secrétaire général

⁹² (ZANU-PF: Zimbabwe African National Union - Patriotic Front / Union nationale africaine - Front patriotique du Zimbabwe)
 (MDC: Movement for Democratic Change / Mouvement pour un changement démocratique)

**LATIN AMERICAN PARLIAMENT
PARLEMENT LATINO-AMERICAIN**

CASTILLO, Elías (Mr./M.), President, Member of the Parliament of Panama / Président, Membre du Parlement panaméen
 CORDERO CUEVA, Fernando (Mr./M.), President of the National Assembly of Ecuador / Président de l'Assemblée nationale de l'Equateur

GAVIDIA, Walter (Mr./M.), Secretary, Inter-Parliamentary Relations, Member of the Parliament of Venezuela / Secrétaire des relations interparlementaires, Membre du Parlement du Venezuela

AQUILES MORENO, Luis (Mr./M.), Member of the Parliament of Venezuela / Membre du Parlement du Venezuela

PELÁEZ GUTIÉRREZ, Humberto (Mr./M.), Executive Secretary / Secrétaire exécutif

APARICIO, Victorino (Mr./M.), Assistant, Secretariat of Inter-Parliamentary Affairs / Assistant au Secrétariat des affaires interparlementaires

**PARLIAMENT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMUNITY OF WEST AFRICAN STATES (ECOWAS)
PARLEMENT DE LA COMMUNAUTE ECONOMIQUE DES ETATS DE L'AFRIQUE DE L'OUEST (CEDEAO)**

EKWEREMADU, Ike (Mr./M.), President, Leader of the delegation / Président, Chef de la délégation

NYAUNU, Michael (Mr./M.), Vice-President / Vice-Président

RIBEIRO VIEIRA, Filomena de Fatima (Ms./Mme), Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement

SEKOU ABDOUL, Quadri Cisse (Mr./M.), Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement

NASSIROU, Halidou (Mr./M.), Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement

BENI, Lar (Mr./M.), Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement

BADA, Georges (Mr./M.), Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement

OBANDE, Domingo (Mr./M.), Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement

DIAKITE, Mohamed (Mr./M.), Member of the ASGP, Secretary General / Membre de l'ASGP, Secrétaire général

TRAORE, Alfred M'Pe (Mr./M.), Acting Director, Parliamentary Affairs / Directeur par intérim des affaires parlementaires

ABALO, Koffi (Mr./M.), Chief Protocol Officer / Chef du protocole

FWANGDER, Ezekiel (Mr./M.), Protocol Officer / Chargé du protocole

NWIGWE, Ndubuisi (Mr./M.), Assistant to the President / Assistant du Président

UTUH, Edward (Mr./M.), Security Officer / Agent de sécurité

OHAYI, Amechi (Mr./M.), Security Officer / Agent de sécurité

**PARLIAMENT OF THE ECONOMIC AND MONETARY COMMUNITY OF CENTRAL AFRICA (CEMAC)
PARLEMENT DE LA COMMUNAUTE ECONOMIQUE ET MONETAIRE DE L'AFRIQUE CENTRALE**

NGOLO, Pierre (Mr./M.), President / Président

NSOBEYA, Santiago (Mr./M.), Vice-President / Vice-Président

ETOUNG ABENA, Parfait (Mr./M.), Administrative Secretary / Secrétaire administratif

NGANONGO, Jean Bruno (Mr./M.), Parliamentary Attaché to the President / Attaché parlementaire du Président

**TRANSITIONAL ARAB PARLIAMENT
PARLEMENT ARABE TRANSITOIRE**

AL SHAMMARI, Saoud (Mr./M.), Deputy Speaker (Saudi Arabia) / Vice-Président (Arabie Saoudite)

AL JARWAN, Ahmed (Mr./M.), Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement

ALSHAMESSY, Ahmed (Mr./M.), Member of Parliament (U.A.E.) / Membre du Parlement (E.A.U.)

MAMOGHLI, Fatma (Ms./Mme), Member of Parliament (Tunisia) / Membre du Parlement (Tunisie)

AL JESHI, Bahija (Ms./Mme), Member of Parliament / Membre du Parlement

FAWZY, Maye (Ms./Mme), Member of Parliament (Egypt) / Membre du Parlement (Egypte)

ZAIDI, Hecham (Mr./M.), Staff / Secrétariat

III. OBSERVERS – OBSERVATEURS**UNITED NATIONS (UN)****ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES (ONU)**

LAUNSKY-TIEFFENTHAL, Peter (Mr./M.), Under-Secretary-General for Communications and Public Information / Secrétaire général adjoint à la communication et à l'information

CASINI, Gherardo (Mr./M.), Head, UN DESA Office in Rome / Chef du Bureau ONU DAES à Rome

SETH, Nikhil (Mr./M.), Director, Division for Sustainable Development, UN DESA / Directeur de la Division du développement durable, ONU DAES

DE SCHUTTER, Olivier (Mr./M.), United Nations Special Rapporteur on the right to food / Rapporteur spécial des Nations Unies pour le droit à l'alimentation

UNITED NATIONS MILLENNIUM CAMPAIGN (UNMC)**CAMPAGNE DU MILLENAIRE DES NATIONS UNIES**

WOODS, Corinne (Ms./Mme), Executive Director / Directrice exécutive

FALU NIJE, Sering (Mr./M.), Deputy Director, Policy, MDG / Sous-Directeur de la politique des OMD

DEVE, Thomas (Mr./M.), Consultant, Africa Office / Consultant, Bureau régional Afrique

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION (ILO)**ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DU TRAVAIL (BIT)**

ROSAS, Gianni (Mr./M.), Expert, Youth Employment / Spécialiste de l'emploi des jeunes

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO)**ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'EDUCATION, LA SCIENCE ET LA CULTURE**

VAN DER POL, Hendrik (Mr./M.), Director, Institute for Statistics / Directeur de l'Institut des statistiques

CORAT, Gülser (Ms./Mme), Director, Division for Gender Equality / Directrice de la Division de l'égalité des genres

OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES (UNHCR)**HAUT-COMMISSARIAT DES NATIONS UNIES POUR LES REFUGIES**

OTIS, Denise (Ms./Mme), Representative / Représentante

UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND (UNICEF)**FONDS DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ENFANCE**

PONET, David (Mr./M.), Parliamentary Specialist / Spécialiste parlementaire

WORLD BANK**BANQUE MONDIALE**

HARBORNE, Bernard (Mr./M.), Lead Conflict Advisor / Spécialiste principal sur les questions de conflits

COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR-TEST-BAN TREATY ORGANIZATION (CTBTO)**ORGANISATION DU TRAITE D'INTERDICTION COMPLETE DES ESSAIS NUCLEAIRES (OTICE)**

TÓTH, Tibor (Mr./M.), Executive Secretary / Secrétaire exécutif

ABDELHAMID, Khaled (Mr./M.), Special Assistant / Assistant spécial

ABELA HAMPEL, Elizabeth (Ms./Mme), External Relations Officer / Chargée des relations extérieures

* * * * *

LEAGUE OF ARAB STATES**LIGUE DES ETATS ARABES**

BENHELLI, Ahmed (Mr./M.), Deputy Secretary General / Secrétaire général adjoint

YUMNI, Mohamed (Mr./M.), Head of International Organizations Division / Chef de la Division des organisations internationales

**AFRICAN PARLIAMENTARY UNION (APU)
UNION PARLEMENTAIRE AFRICAINE (UPA)**

N'ZI, Koffi (Mr./M.), Secretary General / Secrétaire général
CHEROUATI, Samir (Mr./M.), Director / Directeur

**ARAB INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION (AIPU)
UNION INTERPARLEMENTAIRE ARABE (UIPA)**

BOUCHKOUJ, Noureddine (Mr./M.), Secretary General / Secrétaire général
MOKAYES, Ahmad (Mr./M.), Director of Inter-Parliamentary Relations / Directeur des relations interparlementaires

**ASSOCIATION OF SENATES, SHOORA AND EQUIVALENT COUNCILS IN AFRICA AND THE
ARAB WORLD (ASSECAA)
ASSOCIATION DES SENATS, SHOORA ET CONSEILS EQUIVALENTS D'AFRIQUE ET DU
MONDE ARABE**

YUSUF ALI, Abdulwasie (Mr./M.), Secretary General / Secrétaire général

**CONFEDERATION OF PARLIAMENTS OF THE AMERICAS (COPA)
CONFEDERATION PARLEMENTAIRE DES AMERIQUES**

CHAGNON, Jacques (Mr./M.), President, President of the National Assembly of Québec / Président, Président de l'Assemblée nationale du Québec
BÉRUBÉ, Simon (Mr./M.), Adviser / Conseiller
OSPINA D'AMOURS, Marie-Astrid (Ms./Mme), Adviser / Conseillère

**INTERPARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF MEMBER NATIONS OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF
INDEPENDENT STATES (IPA CIS)
ASSEMBLEE INTERPARLEMENTAIRE DES ETATS MEMBRES DE LA COMMUNAUTE DES ETATS
INDEPENDANTS**

JAFAROV, Aydin (Mr./M.), Deputy Secretary General / Secrétaire général adjoint

**INTERPARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY ON ORTHODOXY (IAO)
ASSEMBLEE INTERPARLEMENTAIRE DE L'ORTHODOXIE**

VARNAVA, Georgios (Mr./M.), Member of the Parliament of Cyprus / Membre du Parlement de Chypre

**INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITY ON DEVELOPMENT
(IPU-IGAD)
UNION INTERPARLEMENTAIRE DES ETATS MEMBRES DE L'AUTORITE INTERGOUVERNEMENTALE
POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT (UIP-IGAD)**

BOURHAN, Daoud Ahmed (Mr./M.), Secretary General / Secrétaire général

**MAGHREB CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL
CONSEIL CONSULTATIF DU MAGHREB**

MOKADEM, Said (Mr./M.), Secretary General / Secrétaire général

**PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE BLACK SEA ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (PABSEC)
ASSEMBLEE PARLEMENTAIRE POUR LA COOPERATION ECONOMIQUE DE LA MER NOIRE**

GOGUADZE, Giorgi (Mr./M.), Member (Georgia) / Membre (Géorgie)
KRAYCHEV, Svilen (Mr./M.), Deputy Secretary / Secrétaire adjoint

ORGANISATION FOR SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY (OSCE PA)

ASSEMBLEE PARLEMENTAIRE DE L'ORGANISATION POUR LA SECURITE ET LA COOPERATION EN EUROPE

MIGLIORI, Riccardo (Mr./M.), Member of the Italian Parliament / Membre du Parlement italien

OLIVER, Spencer (Mr./M.), Secretary General / Secrétaire général

PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE TURKIC-SPEAKING COUNTRIES (TURKPA)

ASSEMBLEE PARLEMENTAIRE DES PAYS DE LANGUE TURQUE

AMIRASLANOV, Ahliman (Mr./M.), Member of the Parliament of Azerbaijan / Membre du Parlement d'Azerbaïdjan

HASANOV, Ramil (Mr./M.), Member / Membre

KURSHAD MELIH, Sariarslan (Mr./M.), Deputy Secretary General, Member of the ASGP / Secrétaire général adjoint, Membre de l'ASGP

HASANOV, Emin (Mr./M.), Secretary / Secrétaire

RAHIMOV, Anar (Mr./M.), Secretary / Secrétaire

AGHAYEV, Alasgar (Mr./M.), Secretary / Secrétaire

PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE UNION OF BELARUS AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

ASSEMBLEE PARLEMENTAIRE DE L'UNION DU BELARUS ET DE LA FEDERATION DE RUSSIE

BORTSOV, Nikolay (Mr./M.), Committee Deputy Chairman / Vice-Président de commission

STRELCHENKO, Sergei (Mr./M.), Member of the ASGP, Secretary General / Membre de l'ASGP, Secrétaire général

LEYKAUSKAS, Audryus (Mr./M.), Secretary to the delegation, Head of the Administration Department / Secrétaire de la délégation, Chef du Département de l'administration

STADNIKOVA, Tatyana (Ms./Mme), Secretary to the delegation / Secrétaire de la délégation

PARLIAMENTARY UNION OF THE ORGANIZATION OF THE ISLAMIC CONFERENCE MEMBER STATES (PUIC)

UNION PARLEMENTAIRE DES ETATS MEMBRES DE L'ORGANISATION DE LA CONFERENCE ISLAMIQUE (UPCI)

EROL KLIC, Mahmud (Mr./M.), Secretary General / Secrétaire général

MOHAMMADI SIJANI, Ali Asghar (Mr./M.), Assistant Secretary General / Secrétaire général adjoint

SABRI, Souheila (Mrs./Mme), Secretary to the delegation / Secrétaire de la délégation

**SOUTHERN AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY PARLIAMENTARY FORUM (SADC PF)
FORUM PARLEMENTAIRE DE LA COMMUNAUTE POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT DE L'AFRIQUE AUSTRALE**

MOYO, Lovemore (Mr./M.), Chairman / Président

* * * * *

**SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL
INTERNATIONALE SOCIALISTE**

AYALA, Luis (Mr./M.), Secretary General / Secrétaire général

PERRY, Latifa (Ms./Mme)

**THE GLOBAL FUND TO FIGHT AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS AND MALARIA
LE FONDS MONDIAL DE LUTTE CONTRE LE SIDA, LA TUBERCULOSE ET LE PALUDISME**

ROBINSON, Svend (Mr./M.), Senior Adviser, Parliamentary Relations and Special Initiatives / Conseiller spécial des relations parlementaires et des initiatives spéciales

HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH

SANEL, Faraz (Mr./M.), Researcher, Middle East and North Africa / Chercheur pour le Moyen-Orient et l'Afrique du nord

**INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS (ICRC)
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)**

YOUNG, Robert (Mr./M.), Regional Office, Ottawa / Bureau régional, Ottawa

**PARTNERSHIP FOR MATERNAL, NEWBORN AND CHILD HEALTH (PMNCH)
PARTENARIAT POUR LA SANTE DE LA MERE, DU NOUVEAU-NE ET DE L'ENFANT**

PRESERN, Carole (Ms./Mme), Director / Directrice

PENAL REFORM INTERNATIONAL

DAUBNEY, David (Mr./M.), Representative / Représentant

**WORLD SCOUT PARLIAMENTARY UNION (WSPU)
UNION PARLEMENTAIRE MONDIALE DU SCOUTISME (UPMS)**

CHUNG, Ui-Hwa (Mr./M.), President / Président

**PARLIAMENTS PARTICIPATING AS OBSERVERS WITH A VIEW TO A POSSIBLE
AFFILIATION/REAFFILIATION**

**PARLEMENTS PARTICIPANT EN QUALITE D'OBSERVATEURS EN VUE D'UNE
AFFILIATION/REAFFILIATION EVENTUELLE**

TONGA

TU'UTAFAIVA, Siosifa (Mr./M.)

Member of the Legislative Assembly
Membre de l'Assemblée législative

**PERSONS TAKING PART IN THE WORK OF THE ASSOCIATION OF SECRETARIES GENERAL
OF PARLIAMENTS (ASGP) AND WHOSE NAMES DO NOT ALREADY APPEAR UNDER A
NATIONAL DELEGATION, AN OBSERVER OR ANY OTHER BODY**

**PARTICIPANTS AUX TRAVAUX DE L'ASSOCIATION DES SECRETAIRES GENERAUX DES
PARLEMENTS (ASGP) DONT LE NOM NE FIGURE PAS DEJA AU TITRE D'UNE
DELEGATION NATIONALE, D'UN OBSERVATEUR OU D'UNE AUTRE ENTITE**

**PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE (PACE)
ASSEMBLEE PARLEMENTAIRE DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE (APCE)**

SAWICKI, Wojciech (Mr./M.), Secretary General, Member of the ASGP / Secrétaire général, Membre de l'ASGP

PAKISTAN INSTITUTE FOR PARLIAMENTARY SERVICES (PIPS)

GORAYA, Khan Ahmad (Mr./M.), Executive Director, Member of the ASGP / Directeur exécutif, Membre de l'ASGP

**ADVISERS FOLLOWING THE WORK OF THE 127th ASSEMBLY
OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION
CONSEILLERS SUIVANT LES TRAVAUX DE LA 127^{ème} ASSEMBLEE
DE L'UNION INTERPARLEMENTAIRE**

KUWAIT – KOWEIT

AL-KANDARI, Allam (Mr./M.)
Member of the ASGP / Membre de l'ASGP

Secretary General / Secrétaire général

AL-WEHAIB, Tawfeeq Saud (Mr./M.)

Assistant Secretary General / Secrétaire général adjoint

AL-ENEZI, Shehab (Mr./M.)

Staff / Secrétariat

ALABDULGADER, Nasser (Mr./M.)

Staff / Secrétariat

**SPECIAL GUESTS TAKING PART IN ACTIVITIES FORESEEN ON THE OCCASION
OF THE 127th ASSEMBLY OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION**

**INVITES SPECIAUX PRENANT PART A DES ACTIVITES PREVUES A L'OCCASION
DE LA 127^{ème} ASSEMBLEE DE L'UNION INTERPARLEMENTAIRE**

LAUNSKY-TIEFFENTHAL, Peter (Mr./M.), Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations for Communications and Public Information / Secrétaire général adjoint des Nations Unies à la communication et à l'information

**Special Debate: "Citizenship, Identity and Linguistic and Cultural Diversity in a Globalized World"
Débat spécial sur le thème : "Citoyenneté, identité et diversité linguistique et culturelle à l'ère de
la mondialisation"**

VAN DER POL, Hendrik (Mr./M.), Director, UNESCO Institute for Statistics / Directeur de l'Institut des statistiques de l'UNESCO

Grand Chief JOHN, Edward (Mr./M.), Chairman, United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (Canada) / Président de l'Instance permanente des Nations Unies sur les questions autochtones (Canada)

VOLLEBAEK, Knut (Mr./M.), High Commissioner on National Minorities, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) (Netherlands) / Haut-Commissaire aux minorités nationales à l'Organisation pour la sécurité et la coopération en Europe (OSCE), (Pays-Bas)

**COMMITTEE ON UNITED NATIONS AFFAIRS
COMMISSION DES AFFAIRES DES NATIONS UNIES**

**Roundtable discussion on "Multilateralism and the role of parliamentary diplomacy"
Table ronde sur le thème : "Le multilatéralisme et le rôle de la diplomatie parlementaire"**

TRAORÉ, Mélégué (Mr./M.), President of the IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs / Président de la Commission UIP des affaires des Nations Unies

EVANS, Nigel (Mr./M.), Deputy Speaker of Parliament United Kingdom, Moderator / Vice-Président du Parlement du Royaume-Uni, Modérateur

ZZIWA NANTONGO, Margaret (Ms./Mme), Speaker of the East African Legislative Assembly (EALA) / Présidente de l'Assemblée législative est-africaine (ALEA)

MIGNON, Jean-Claude (Mr./M.), President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) / Président de l'Assemblée parlementaire du Conseil de l'Europe

Al-SHAMMARI, Saud (Mr./M.), Vice-President of the Transitional Arab Parliament / Vice-Président du Parlement arabe transitoire

KABORE, Roch Marc Christian (Mr./M.), President of the Assemblée parlementaire de la francophonie (APF) / Président de l'Assemblée parlementaire de la francophonie

NNAEMEKA AMADI, Bethel (Mr./M.), President of the Pan-African Parliament / Président du Parlement panafricain

MIGLIORI, Riccardo (Mr./M.), President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly (OSCE PA) / Président de l'Assemblée parlementaire de l'OSCE

PELÁEZ GUTIÉRREZ, Humberto (Mr./M.), Executive Secretary of the Latin American Parliament / Secrétaire exécutif du Parlement latino-américain

KILIC, Mahmud Erol (Mr./M.), Secretary General, Parliamentary Union of the Organization of the Islamic Conference Member States (PUIC) / Secrétaire général de l'Union Parlementaire des Etats Membres de l'organisation de la Conférence islamique (UPCI)

RAFI, Shazia (Ms./Mme), Secretary General, Parliamentarians for Global Action (PGA) / Secrétaire générale, Parliamentarians for Global Action (PGA)

HIEBERT, Russ (Mr./M.), Chair of the Canadian Branch of the CPA / Président du Bureau canadien du CPA

Debate: Does the UN take "democracy" seriously enough?**Débat: Les Nations Unies prennent-elles la démocratie suffisamment au sérieux ?**

SPEHAR, Elizabeth (Ms./Mme), Director, Europe Division, United Nations Department of Political Affairs / Directrice de la Division Europe, Département des affaires politiques de l'Organisation des Nations Unies

HELGESEN, Vidar (Mr./M.), Secretary General of the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) / Secrétaire général de l'Institut international pour la démocratie et l'assistance électorale (IDEA)

MANDELBAUM, Andrew (Mr./M.), Senior Program Officer, National Democratic Institute (United States of America) / Chargé principal de programme, National Democratic Institute (Etats-Unis d'Amérique)

ORTIZ MASSÓ, Melissa (Ms./Mme), Researcher, FUNDAR, Center for Analysis and Research (Mexico) / Chercheuse de FUNDAR, Centre d'analyses et recherche (Mexique)

MILL, Eric (Mr./M.), Web and mobile developer, Sunlight Foundation / Concepteur web et services de téléphonie mobile, Sunlight Foundation

Launch of the Handbook: Supporting Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament**Lancement du Guide : Promouvoir la non-prolifération et le désarmement nucléaires**

CHOWDHURY, Saber (Mr./M.), MP, Bangladesh, President of the IPU Standing Committee on Peace and international Security / Parlementaire, Bangladesh, Président de la Commission permanente de l'UIP de la paix et de la sécurité internationale

LAVERDIÈRE, Hélène (Ms./Mme), MP, Canada, Deputy Chair of Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament (PNND) / Parlementaire, Canada, Vice-Présidente de Parlementaires pour la non-prolifération nucléaire et le désarmement (PNND)

VAN RIET, Rob (Mr./M.), World Future Council, Lead Author

TOTH, Tibor (Mr./M.), Executive Secretary, CTBTO / Secrétaire exécutif de CTBTO

RYDELL, Randy (Mr./M.), Senior Adviser, UN Office for Disarmament Affairs / Conseiller principal, Bureau des Affaires de désarmement de l'ONU

WARE, Alyn (Mr./M.), Global Coordinator, PNND / Coordinateur global de PNND

RIO+ 20 in perspective: What hope for sustainable development ?**RIO+ 20 en perspective : quel espoir pour le développement durable ?**

WOODS, Corinne (Ms./Mme), Director, United Nations Millenium Campaign / Directrice, Objectif du millénaire pour le développement

SETH, Nikhil (Mr./M.), Director, Division for Sustainable Development, UN-DESA / Directeur de la Division du développement durable, UN-DESA

DE SCHUTTER, Olivier (Mr./M.), Special Rapporteur on the right to food, OHCHR / Rapporteur spécial sur le droit à l'alimentation, HCDH

BUSTAMANTE, Fernando (Mr./M.), Member of the Parliament of Ecuador / Membre du Parlement de l'Equateur

MOONEY, Patrick (Mr./M.), Executive Director ETC Group, Moderator / Directeur exécutif du Groupe ETC, Modérateur

UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Five years on**Déclaration des Nations Unies sur le droit des peuples autochtones : cinq ans plus tard**

Grand Chief JOHN, Edward (Mr./M.), Chairman, United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (Canada) / Président de l'Instance permanente des Nations Unies sur les questions autochtones (Canada)

HENARE, Tau (Mr./M.), MP, New Zealand / Membre du Parlement néo-zélandais

PANEL DISCUSSIONS**REUNIONS-DEBAT****Panel discussion on: "Enforcing the responsibility to protect: The role of parliament in safeguarding civilians' lives"** (item under consideration by the First Standing Committee)**Réunion-débat sur le thème : "Responsabilité de protéger : le rôle des parlementaires dans la protection des civils"** (thème d'étude de la première Commission permanente)

LUCK, Edward (Mr./M.), Former UN Special Advisor on the Responsibility to Protect / Ancien Conseiller spécial de l'ONU pour la responsabilité de protéger

PARK, Tina (Ms./Mme), Co-founder and Executive Director of the Canadian Centre for R2P / Co-fondatrice et directrice exécutive du Centre canadien R2P

Panel discussion on : "Fair trade and innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable development"
(item under consideration by the Second Standing Committee)

Réunion-débat sur le thème : "Commerce équitable et mécanismes novateurs de financement pour un développement durable" (thème d'étude de la deuxième Commission permanente)

CLARK, Michael (Mr./M.), Inter-Regional Adviser, UNCTAD / Conseiller inter-régional de la CNUCED

Panel Discussion on: "The use of media, including social media, to enhance citizen engagement and democracy" (item under consideration by the Third Standing Committee)

Réunion-débat sur le thème : "Le recours à divers médias, y compris les médias sociaux, pour accroître la participation et améliorer la démocratie" (thème d'étude de la troisième Commission permanente)

WILLIAMSON, Andy (Mr./M.), CEO of Future Digital and former Head of the Digital Democracy Programme at the Hansard Society / PDG de Future Digital et ancien responsable du programme Démocratie numérique de la Hansard Society

Panel discussion on: "Creating opportunities for youth in today's global economy"

Réunion-débat sur le thème : "Ouvrir des perspectives à la jeunesse dans l'économie mondialisée d'aujourd'hui"

ARMSTRONG, Scott (Mr./M.), Member of the Canadian Parliament / Membre du Parlement canadien

ROSAS, Gianni (Mr./M.), Lead Expert in the field of Youth Employment / Spécialiste de l'emploi des jeunes

Panel discussion on: "Building Peace after Conflict"

Réunion-débat sur le thème : "Consolidation de la paix après un conflit"

MENSAH WILLIAMS, Margaret (Ms./Mme), Vice-Chairperson of the National Council of Namibia, Moderator / Vice-Présidente du Conseil national de la Namibie, Modératrice

MUKANTABANA, Rose (Ms./Mme), Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies of Rwanda / Présidente de la Chambre des Députés du Rwanda

CHENG-HOPKINS, Judy (Ms./Mme), Assistant UN Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support / Sous-Secrétaire générale à la consolidation de la paix (ONU)

DEL CASTILLO, Graciana (Ms./Mme), Adjunct Professor of International and Public Affairs, Columbia School of International and Public Affairs / Professeure associée, Affaires internationales et publiques, Columbia School of International and Public Affairs

YONGMEI ZHOU (Ms./Mme), World Bank Manager / Directrice de la Banque mondiale

Panel discussion on: "Parliamentary immunity: benefit or burden?"

Réunion-débat sur le thème : "L'immunité parlementaire : un bienfait ou un fardeau ?"

TAPO, Kassoum (Mr./M.), President of the IPU Committee on the Human Rights of parliamentarians, Member of the National Assembly of Mali / Président du Comité des droits de l'homme des parlementaires, Membre de l'Assemblée nationale du Mali

CORZO ROMÁN, Juan Manuel (Mr./M.), Senator, Colombia / Sénateur colombien

MAINGOT, J.P. Joseph (Mr./M.), Former Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel of the House of Commons and Member of the Law Reform Commission of Canada / Ancien Greffier et Conseiller parlementaire de la Chambre des Communes et Membre de la Commission de la réforme législative du Canada

WILLIAMS, John (Mr./M.), Chief Operating Officer, Global Organization of Parliamentarians against Corruption, GOPAC / Directeur des opérations de l'Organisation mondiale des parlementaires contre la corruption (GOPAC)

Panel discussion on: "Peak Oil: What Prospects for Energy Security?"

Réunion-débat sur le thème : "Pic pétrolier : quelles sont les perspectives en matière de sécurité énergétique ?"

ALEKLETT, Kjell (Mr./M.), President of the Association for the Study of Peak Oil & Gas (ASPO) / Président de l'Association pour l'étude du pic pétrolier et du gaz

RUBIN, Jeff (Mr./M.), Author / Ecrivain

RUSNAK, Urban (Mr./M.), Secretary General, Energy Charter / Secrétaire général de Energy Charter

KORIN, Anne (Ms./Mme), Co-Director, Institute for the Analysis of Global Security (IAGS) and Adviser to the United States Energy Security Council / Co-directrice de l'Institut d'analyse de la sécurité mondiale (IAGS) et Conseillère auprès du Conseil de la sécurité énergétique des Etats-Unis

Informal Panel on: "Parliamentary and Political Law"

Débat informel sur le thème : "Droit parlementaire et droit politique"

DE LANGÉ, Johannes Hendrik (Mr./M.), MP, South Africa / Membre du Parlement sud-africain

PRUD'HOMME, Marcel (Mr./M.), Former Member of the Canadian Parliament / Ancien Membre du Parlement canadien

WALSH, Rob (Mr./M.), Former Law Clerk, House of Commons of Canada / Ancien Greffier de la Chambre des Communes du Canada

Joint IPU-ASGP session

Session conjointe UIP-ASGP

ÁVILA, Guillermo (Mr./M.), Researcher, Fundar, Center for Analysis and Research (Mexico) / Chercheur de Fundar, Centre d'analyses et recherches (Mexique)

GREEN, Monica (Ms./Mme), Member of the Swedish Parliament / Membre du parlement suédois

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

BUREAU DU PRÉSIDENT DE L'UNION INTERPARLEMENTAIRE

EL KHETTAR, Hassan (Mr./M.)

Head of the Office of the President / Chef du Bureau du Président